Drawing from U.S. Census projections for 2003, I included the percentage of the voting-age population in each county that was Hispanic or African-American to control for ethnicity and race. I controlled for age using the 2003 Census projection for the percentage of county residents age 65 and older, and I controlled for socioeconomic status by including the median household income for 2002 in each county.[9]

I estimated a series of random effects models to account for the likelihood that data from counties were correlated within each state (for further explanation of random effects and other multilevel models, see Bryk and Raudenbush 1992, Luke 2004, Singer 1998).[10] I allowed the median income variable to have both fixed and random effects in each state to take into account variation in the cost of living in each state. The dependent variable in each model was voter turnout at the county level, with turnout calculated as the percentage of the estimated citizen voting-age population that voted in the 2004 election.

[Table 2 here]

Turning first to an analysis using the maximum identification requirements, two of the four requirements had a small and negative effect on turnout in 2004: matching one's signature and providing a non-photo identification. Taking into account the reference variable of stating one's name, the results indicate that turnout was lower in states that required signature matches or a non-photo identification than in states that required voters to simply state their name, holding constant the electoral context and demographic variables.

Two contextual factors -- whether the county was in a state that was a battleground state and whether that state had a competitive race for governor and/or U.S. Senate– increased voter turnout. The time between the closing date for registration and the election had a slight negative effect on turnout. As the percentage of Hispanics in the county's population increased, turnout declined. The percentage of senior citizens in the county and household median income had positive effects on turnout. The percentage of African-Americans in the county did not have a significant effect.

The effects of the minimum voter identification requirements were non-existent. None of the dummy variables for voter identification requirements were statistically significant. Being a battleground state and having a competitive statewide race were significant and positive, as was the percentage of senior citizens in the county and household median income. The percentage of Hispanics in the county's population continued to have a negative effect on turnout, as did the number of days between the closing date for registration and the election.

I then sought to test the hypothesis that voter identification requirements dampen turnout among minorities, a claim voiced by some critics of the requirements. To test this idea I incorporated a series of interactions between the maximum and minimum voter identification requirements and the percentage of African-Americans and Hispanics living in the counties. In each case the interactions did not improve the fit of the models to the data. A chi-square test of the difference in the deviance for each model (represented by -2 log likelihood in Table 2),

[9] To bring the income figures into a scale comparable to those of the other variables, I used the natural log of median household income.

[10] The data analyses provided evidence that there was, indeed, a clustering of data within each state. The intraclass correlation, bounded by 0 and 1, measures the variation between the states. A random intercept model using only the intercept as a predictor generated an intraclass correlation of .43, indicating considerable variation between the states.

showed no significant improvement by including the interactions ($p > 0.05$). I report the coefficients for the models with the interactions in the Appendix in tables A-2 and A-3.

Analysis of the aggregate data at the county level generates some support for the hypothesis that as the identification requirements for voting vary, so does turnout. Specifically, in terms of the maximum requirements, the results suggest that requiring a signature match or non-photo identification is negatively related to turnout compared to requiring that a voter state his or her name. But the analysis showed that adding interactions between identification requirements and the percentage of the county that was African-American or Hispanic did not improve the fit of the model to the data.

Aggregate data, however, cannot fully capture the individual demographic factors that may figure into the decision to turn out to vote. For example, previous research has found that education is a powerful determinant of turnout (Wolfinger and Rosenstone 1980, but see also Nagler 1991).[11] Married individuals also are more likely to vote than those who are not married (Alvarez and Ansolabehere 2002; Alvarez, Nagler and Wilson 2004; Fisher, Kenny, and Morton 1993). To fully explore the effects of voter identification requirements on turnout, it is important to examine individual-level data as well.

Individual-level analysis

Individual-level turnout data exists in the November 2004 Current Population Survey conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau. The Census Bureau conducts the CPS monthly to measure unemployment and other workforce data, but the bureau adds a battery of voter participation questions to the November survey in even-numbered years to coincide with either a presidential or midterm Congressional election.

One of the advantages of the CPS is the sheer size of the sample. The survey's Voting and Registration Supplement consisted of interviews, either by telephone or in person, with 96,452 respondents.[12] The large sample size permits analyses of smaller groups, such as Black or Hispanic voters or voters with less than a high school education. The analyses reported here are based on reports from self-described registered voters. I omitted those who said they were not registered to vote. I also excluded those who said they cast absentee ballots because the identification requirements for absentee ballots may differ from those required when one votes in person. In addition, I eliminated from the sample respondents who said they were not U.S. citizens because the questionnaire design skipped those individuals past the voter registration and turnout questions in the survey.

The dependent variable in these analyses is whether a respondent said he or she voted in the November 2004 election.[13] As in the analysis of aggregate data, I coded the voter

[11] A reviewer for an earlier version of this paper recommended adding an education variable to the aggregate model. One version of the aggregate model not reported here included the percentage of adults in the county who had at least a college degree. The measure was highly collinear with the percentage of residents living below the poverty line, necessitating removal of the college degree variable from the model.

[12] It is important to note that the Census Bureau allows respondents to answer on behalf of themselves and others in the household during the interview. While proxy reporting of voter turnout raises the possibility of inaccurate reports concerning whether another member of the household voted, follow-up interviews with those for whom a proxy report had been given in the November 1984 CPS showed 99 percent agreement between the proxy report and the information given by the follow-up respondent (U.S. Census Bureau 1990).

[13] The U.S. Census Bureau reported, based on the November 2004 CPS, that 89 percent of those who identified themselves as registered voters said they voted in 2004 (U.S. Census Bureau 2005). Previous research has shown

identification requirements as a series of dummy variables, coding each variable as one if the requirement existed in a given state, and zero otherwise. This yielded five dichotomous variables for maximum requirements (state name, sign name, match signature, non-photo identification, or photo identification), and five dichotomous variables for minimum requirements (state name, sign name, match signature, non-photo identification, or providing an affidavit). I omitted the variable for stating one's name so that it could serve as the reference category in comparison with the other four identification requirements in each of the statistical analyses.[14]

In addition to the voter identification requirements, the models include two other state-level factors that might have influenced turnout in 2004: whether the state was considered a battleground state in the presidential election, and whether there was a gubernatorial and/or U.S. Senate race in the state (see Alvarez and Ansolabehere 2002, Alvarez et al. 2004, and Kenny et al. 1993 for similar approaches). As in the aggregate data analysis, the threshold that determined whether the state was a battleground state or had a competitive statewide race was a margin of victory of five percent or less.[15] At the individual level, I controlled for gender, household income, and dummy variables for race/ethnicity, age and education. In terms of race and ethnicity, I created dummy variables to represent whether a voter was Black/non-Hispanic, Hispanic, or Asian (with white/non-Hispanic/other voters as the omitted category for reference purposes). I separated education into five dummy variables: less than high school, high school diploma, some college, college graduate, and graduate training. I omitted the "less than high school" variable from the model for reference purposes. Regarding age, I created four dummy variables to represent 18 to 24 years of age, 29 to 44, 45 to 64, and 65 years and older. I omitted the 18-to-24 category as the reference variable in the model.

Drawing on previous research on voting behavior, I also controlled for whether an individual was employed, or at least a member of the workforce (as opposed to being a full-time student, a homemaker, or retired). Both employment and workforce membership have been shown to be positive predictors of turnout (see Mitchell and Wlezien 1995). Marital status, whether one is a native-born citizen and residential mobility also have emerged as significant predictors of turnout (Alvarez and Ansolabehere 2002, Alvarez et al. 2004, Kenney et al. 1993, Wolfinger and Rosenstone 1980). I included in the model variables for whether a respondent was married (coded 1 if yes, 0 otherwise), and whether one was a native-born citizen (coded 1 if yes, 0 otherwise). I measured residential mobility by coding for whether the respondent had moved to a new address in the six months prior to the interview (coded 1 if yes, 0 otherwise).

Results

---

that, generally speaking, some survey respondents overstate their incidence of voting. Researchers speculate that over-reports may be due to the social desirability that accompanies saying one has done his or her civic duty, or a reluctance to appear outside the mainstream of American political culture (U.S. Census Bureau 1990). It is also possible that voting is an indication of civic engagement that predisposes voters to agree to complete surveys at a higher rate than non-voters (Flanigan and Zingale 2002). Hence the voter turnout rates reported in the CPS tend to be up to 10 percentage points higher than the actual turnout rate for the nation (Flanigan and Zingale 2002). Even with this caveat, however, the CPS serves as a widely accepted source of data on voting behavior.

[14] Earlier versions of this paper included an individual-level analysis that included the five maximum voter identification requirements combined into a continuous variable. The results of that analysis, which found that voter identification requirements had a negative relationship with turnout, can be found in table A-4 in the Appendix.

[15] Given that the individual-level analysis focused on registered voters (as opposed to the citizen voting-age population in the aggregate analysis), I did not include the closing date for registration as a predictor of turnout in the individual-level analysis.

The dependent variable is whether a respondent said he or she voted in the November 2004 election (coded 1 for yes, 0 for no). I estimated models using probit analysis, which calculates the effects of independent variables on the probability that an event occurred – in this case whether a respondent said he or she voted. I estimated the models using robust standard errors to control for correlated error terms for observations from within the same state.

[Table 3 here]

The two models in Table 3 use either the maximum or minimum voter identification requirements in each state. The two models generate similar results. In each model, three of the voter identification requirements exert a statistically significant, negative effect on whether survey respondents said they had voted in 2004. In other words, compared to states that require voters only to state their names, the requirements to sign one's name, provide a non-photo identification, photo identification in the maximum requirements or affidavit in the minimum requires exert a negative influence on turnout.

Of the other state factors, only the competitiveness of the presidential race had a significant effect on turnout. In terms of demographic influences, African-American voters were more likely than white voters or other voters to say they had cast a ballot, while Asian-Americans were less likely than white or other voters to say they had turned out. Hispanic voters were not statistically different from white or other voters in terms of reported turnout. Consistent with previous research, income, and marital status all were positive predictors of voting. Women also were more likely to say they voted than men. Among the age categories, those ages 45 to 64 and 65 and older were more likely than those ages 18 to 24 to say they voted. Respondents who had earned a high school diploma, attended some college, graduated from college or attended graduate school were all more likely to say they voted than those who had finished high school. Respondents who had moved within six months before the interview were less likely to say they had voted.

While the probit models provide statistical support for the influence of voter identification requirements and other variables on turnout, probit coefficients do not lend themselves to intuitive interpretation. Another common approach in studies of election requirements is to examine how the predicted probability of voter turnout would vary as election requirements vary. I used the probit coefficients to calculate the predicted probability of voting at each level of voter identification requirements while holding all other independent variables in the models at their means.[16] I calculated the probabilities taking into account both maximum and minimum requirements.

[Table 4 here]

Taking into account that signature matches were not a predictor of turnout, the differences in predicted probability appear to decline from stating one's name to providing a photo identification or affidavit. Voters in states that required photo identification were 2.7 percent less likely to vote than voters in states where individuals had to give their names.[17] In terms of the

[16] In the case of dichotomous independent variables, holding them at their mean amounted to holding them at the percentage of the sample that was coded 1 for the variable (Long 1997).

[17] The voter turnout percentages may seem disproportionately high compared to the turnout rates reported in the aggregate data analysis. It is important to consider that the turnout rates in the aggregate data were a proportion of

minimum requirement, voters in states that required an affidavit at minimum were 4 percent less likely to turn out than voters in states where they had to give their names.

The differences were more pronounced for those lower in education. Constraining the model to show predicted probabilities only for those with less than a high school diploma, the probability of voting was 5.1 percent lower in states that required photo identification as the maximum requirement and 7 percent lower in states that required an affidavit as the minimum requirement compared to states where stating one's name was the maximum or minimum requirement.

Race and ethnicity have generated particular interest in the debate over voter identification requirements. But incorporating dummy variables for Hispanics, African-Americans, and Asian-Americans into one model carries the implicit assumption that the remaining variables, including education and income, will influence each of these groups in a similar manner in terms of deciding whether to vote. These assumptions are not always born out by the data (see Leighley and Vedlitz, 1999.) To isolate the effects of voter identification and other variables on voter turnout within specific racial and ethnic groups, I divided the sample into sub-samples and re-ran the probit models.

[Table 5 here]

The effects of voter identification requirements were similar for white voters compared to the entire sample, which was not surprising given that white voters comprised 81 percent of the sample. Voters in states where the maximum requirement involved signing one's name, providing a non-photo identification or photo identification were less likely to vote than those in a state that required voters to give their names. Taking into consideration the minimum requirements, this was true only for voters in states that require a non-photo identification or an affidavit. White voters in photo identification states were 3.7 percent less likely to vote than were white voters in states where respondents gave their names. The difference in probability was 4.4 percent for voters in states where an affidavit was the minimum requirement.

Voter identification requirements also influenced turnout among Black voters, but to a lesser extent relative to white voters.

[Table 6 here]

Of the maximum voter identification requirements, only the non-photo identification requirement reduced turnout compared to turnout in states that required voters to state their names. The predicted probability of voting was 5.7 percent lower for Black respondents in states that required non-photo identification. In terms of age, only African-Americans age 65 and older were more likely to vote than respondents in the 18 to 24 referent group. Respondents in all levels of education were more likely to vote than respondents without a high school diploma. Gender, income, living in a battleground state, being a part of the workforce and having been born in the United States also were positive predictors. Recent mobility tended to lower the probability of voting. None of the minimum identification requirements had a significant effect on voting, while most of the remaining variables had effects similar to those in the maximum requirement model.

---

all citizens of voting-age population, while the turnout rates for the individual-level data are the proportion of only registered voters who said they voted.

Hispanic voters also were less likely to vote in states that required non-photo identification as opposed to stating one's name.

[Table 7 here]

Using the coefficients from Table 7 to calculate predicted probabilities, for both the maximum and minimum requirements, Hispanic voters were 10 percent less likely to vote in non-photo identification states compared to states where voters only had to give their name. Hispanic voters ages 45 to 64 and 65 and over were more likely to vote than their 18-to-24-year-old counterparts. Education and income also were positive predictors of voting. Interestingly, being a native-born citizen lowered the probability of voting, while native-born citizenship was a positive predictor for African-American voters and was not a predictor at all for white voters. It may be that naturalized citizens of Hispanic descent are more conscious of the value of voting rights than other groups.

Varying voter identification requirements influenced Asian-American voters as well. As with Hispanic and Black voters, Asian-American voters were less likely to turn out in states with non-photo identification requirements than in states where voters gave their names.

[Table 8 here]

Using the probit coefficients to calculate predicted probabilities, Asian-American voters were 8.5 percent less likely to vote in states that required non-photo identification compared to states that require voters to state their names under the maximum requirements, and they were 6.1 percent less likely to vote where non-photo identification was the minimum requirement. Asian-American voters also were 2.2 percent less likely to vote when signatures were the maximum requirement compared to stating one's name.

In terms of other predictors, there were no significant differences in terms of age or income. In contrast to Hispanic voters, where one was a naturalized or natural-born citizen did not affect the probability of voting. Those with high school or college diplomas or graduate training were more likely to turn out than those with less than a high school diploma. Women and married voters also were more likely to turn out than men and voters who were note married.

Discussion and conclusion

The results presented here provide evidence that as voter identification requirements vary, voter turnout does as well. This point emerged from both the aggregate data and the individual-level data, although not always for both the maximum and minimum sets of requirements. The overall effect for all registered voters was fairly small, but still statistically significant.

In the aggregate data, requirements that voters match signatures on file, provide a non-photo identification or photo identification had negative effects on turnout compared to requiring that voters state their names. Interactions with specific groups – African-Americans and Hispanics – did not improve the fit of the aggregate data to the models. But differences emerged among specific groups in the individual-level data. The signature, non-photo identification and photo identification requirements all had negative effects compared to the requirement that voters simply state their names. These effects translated into reduced probabilities of voting of about 3 to 4 percent for the entire sample, with larger differences for specific subgroups. For

example, the predicted probability that Hispanics would vote in states that required non-photo identification was about 10 percentage points lower than in states where Hispanic voters gave their names. The difference was about 6 percent for African-Americans and Asian-Americans, and about 2 percent for white voters (the gap widened to 3.7 percent for white voters when comparing photo identification to simply stating one's name).

That the non-photo identification requirement was the most consistent in terms of statistical significance across the groups is intriguing given the intense debates surrounding photo identification requirements. This begs the question as to why photo identification requirements did not have a greater influence in 2004. It may have been due to the fact that photo identification was a maximum requirement in only five states, and each of those states accepted another type of identification as a minimum requirement.

In examining the effects of voter identification requirements on turnout, there is still much to learn. The data examined in this project could not capture the dynamics of how identification requirements might lower turnout. If these requirements dampen turnout, is it because individuals are aware of the requirements and stay away from the polls because they cannot or do not want to meet the requirements?[18] Or, do the requirements result in some voters being turned away when they cannot meet the requirements on Election Day? The CPS data do not include measures that can answer this question. Knowing more about the "on the ground" experiences of voters concerning identification requirements could guide policy-makers at the state and local level in determining whether and at what point in the electoral cycle a concerted public information campaign might be most effective in helping voters to meet identification requirements. Such knowledge also could help in designing training for election judges to handle questions about, and potential disputes over, voter identification requirements.

[18] The individual-level data offer some insight here. If advance knowledge of the voter identification requirements were to dampen turnout, it is reasonable to expect that advance knowledge of those requirements also could discourage some individuals from registering to vote. I ran the same probit models using the November 2004 Current Population Survey data and voter registration as the dependent variable (coded 1 if the respondent said he or she was registered, and 0 if the respondent was not registered). Of all of the voter identification requirements, only requiring signatures or matching signatures had a significant effect on whether a respondent said he or she was registered to vote in 2004. In each instance the effect was negative.

References

Alvarez, R. Michael, and Stephen Ansolabehere. (2002). *California Votes: The Promise of Election Day Registration.* New York: Demos. Retrieved online Feb. 23, 2006 at http://www.demos.org/pubs/california_votes.pdf

Alvarez, R. Michael, Jonathan Nagler, and Catherine H. Wilson. (2004). *Making Voting Easier: Election Day Registration in New York.* New York: Demos. Retrieved online Feb. 23, 2006 at http://www.demos.org/pubs/EDR%20-%20NY%20report%20b&w%20-%20Aug%202004.pdf

Baxter, Tom, and Jim Galloway. (2005). Latinos weigh in on voter ID debate. *The Atlanta Journal-Constitution*, March 21, 2005, p. 2-B.

Bryk, Anthony S., and Stephen W. Raudenbush. (1992). *Hierarchical Linear Models: Applications and Data Analysis Methods.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Electionline.org. (2002). *Election Reform Briefing: Voter Identification.* Washington, D.C.: Electionline.org.

Filer, John E., Lawrence W. Kenny, and Rebecca B. Morton. (1993). Redistribution, income, and voting. *American Journal of Political Science*, 37:63-87.

Flanigan, William H., and Nancy H. Zingale. (2002). *Political Behavior of the American Electorate, 10th Ed.* Washington, DC: CQ Press.

Jacobs, Sonji. (2005). Legislature '05: Black lawmakers plot path in photo ID fight. *The Atlanta Journal-Constitution*, March 24, 2005, p. 1-C.

Leighley, Jan E. and Arnold Vedlitz. (1999). Race, ethnicity, and political participation: Competing models and contrasting explanations. *The Journal of Politics*, 61(4):1092-1114.

Long, J. Scott. (1997). *Regression Models for Categorical and Limited Dependent Variables.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Luke, Douglas A. (2004). *Multilevel Modeling.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

McDonald, Michael P., and Samuel L. Popkin. (2001). The myth of the vanishing voter. The American Political Science Review, 85:963-974.

Mitchell, Glenn E., and Christopher Wlezien. (1995) The impact of legal constraints on voter registration, turnout, and the composition of the American electorate. *Political Behavior*, 17:179-302.

Nagler, Jonathan. (1991). The effect of registration laws and education on U.S. voter turnout. *The American Political Science Review*, 85:1393-1405.

Singer, J.D. (1998). Using SAS PROC MIXED to fit multilevel models, hierarchical models, and linear growth models. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics*, 24:323-355

U.S. Census Bureau. (1990). *Studies in the Measurement of Voter Turnout.* Retrieved online March 13, 2006, at http://www.census.gov/population/socdemo/voting/p23-168.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2005). U.S. voter turnout up in 2004, Census Bureau Reports. News release issued May 26, 2005. Retrieved online March 13, 2006 at http://www.census.gov/Press-Release/www/releases/archives/voting/004986.html

U.S. Election Assistance Commission. (2005) Election Day Survey. Retrieved online March 28, 2006 at http://www.eac.gov/election_survey_2004/html/EDS-chap%201%20pop%20estimates2.htm.

Wolfinger, Raymond E., and Steven J. Rosenstone. (1980). *Who Votes?* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Young, Virginia. (2006). ID foe says bill smacks of "Jim Crow" era. *The St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, Feb. 14, 2006, p. B-1.

Table 1 – Variation in 2004 State Turnout Based on Voter Identification Requirements			
Maximum Requirement		**Minimum Requirement**	
Voter Identification Required in the States	**Mean Voter Turnout for States in that Category**	**Voter Identification Required in the States**	**Mean Voter Turnout for States in that Category**
State Name	64.2 %	**State Name**	63.0 %
Sign Name	61.1 %	**Sign Name**	60.8 %
Match Signature	60.9 %	**Match Signature**	61.7 %
Provide Non-Photo ID	59.3 %	**Provide Non-Photo ID**	59.0 %
Provide Photo ID	58.1 %	**Swear Affidavit**	60.1 %
Average Turnout for All States	60.9 %		

Table 2. Predictors of 2004 turnout at the county level taking into account maximum and minimum voter identification requirements

	Maximum Requirements		Minimum Requirements	
Variable	**Unstandardized Estimate**	**Standard Error**	**Unstandardized Estimate**	**Standard Error**
Intercept	-1.34**	0.14	-1.36**	0.4
Sign Name	-0.01	0.012	0.002	0.02
Match Signature	-0.03*	0.014	-0.001	0.02
Non-photo ID	-0.04**	0.013	-0.01	0.02
Photo Identification	-0.02	0.019	----	----
Affidavit	----	----	-0.01	0.02
Battleground State	0.04**	0.01	0.04**	0.01
Competitive Senate/Governor's Race	0.04**	0.01	0.04*	0.02
Registration Closing Date	-0.002**	0.0005	-0.003**	0.001
% African-American	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01
% Hispanic	-0.05**	0.01	-0.05**	0.01
% Age 65 or older	0.82**	0.03	0.82**	0.03
Median Household Income	0.18**	0.01	0.18**	0.01
-2 Log Likelihood	-8953.8		-8946.9	

Coefficients are restricted maximum likelihood estimates. N = 3,111. * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ (one-tailed tests)

Table 3. Probit model of voter turnout.

	Maximum Requirements		Minimum Requirements	
Variable	**Unstandardized Estimate**	**Standard Error**	**Unstandardized Estimate**	**Standard Error**
Sign name	-0.11*	0.05	-0.08*	0.04
Match signature	-0.04	0.05	-0.03	0.05
Non-photo ID	-0.16**	0.06	-0.15**	0.05
Photo ID	-0.17**	0.07	----	----
Affidavit	----	----	-0.23**	0.06
Hispanic	-0.08	0.05	-0.08	0.05
African-American	0.24**	0.04	0.24**	0.04
Asian-American	-0.37**	0.07	-0.38**	0.07
Age 25-44	0.004	0.02	0.003	0.02
Age 45-64	0.26**	0.03	0.26**	0.03
Age65+	0.43**	0.03	0.43**	0.03
High School	0.31**	0.02	0.31**	0.02
Some college	0.57**	0.03	0.57**	0.03
College	0.88**	0.04	0.88**	0.04
Graduate School	0.98**	0.05	0.98**	0.05
Household income	0.03**	0.003	0.03**	0.003
Married	0.23**	0.02	0.23**	0.02
Female	0.10**	0.01	0.10**	0.01
Battleground state	0.17**	0.04	0.18**	0.04
Competitive race	0.05	0.06	0.05	0.05
Employed	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
Member of workforce	-0.05	0.05	-0.05	0.05
Native-born citizen	0.02	0.04	0.02	0.04
Moved within past 6 months	-0.29**	0.03	-0.29**	0.03
Constant	-0.09	0.10	-0.09	0.09
Pseudo-R-Squared	0.09		0.10	

Notes: N = 54,973 registered voters

$p < .05$* $p < .01$** (one-tailed tests)

Models were estimated with robust standard errors to correct for correlated error terms within each state.

Data source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, Voting and Registration Supplement, November 2004

Table 4. Predicted probability of voter turnout – full model		
	Maximum requirement	**Minimum requirement**
State name	0.917	0.915
Sign name	0.899	0.902
Match signature	(N.S.)	(N.S.)
Non-photo ID	0.890	0.890
Photo ID	0.888	----
Affidavit	----	0.875
Total difference from "state name" to "photo identification" or "affidavit"	0.029	0.040
N	54,973	

Figures represent the predicted probability of registered voters saying they voted as the identification requirement varies stating one's name to providing photo identification or an affidavit, with all other variables held constant. N.S. = nonsignificant coefficient in the probit model.

Data source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, Voting and Registration Supplement, November 2004.

Table 5. Probit model of turnout for White voters.

	Maximum Requirements		Minimum Requirements	
Variable	**Unstandardized Estimate**	**Standard Error**	**Unstandardized Estimate**	**Standard Error**
Sign name	-0.10*	0.05	-0.07	0.04
Match signature	-0.04	0.05	-0.01	0.06
Non-photo ID	-0.14**	0.06	-0.14**	0.06
Photo ID	-0.22**	0.08	----	----
Affidavit	----	----	-0.26**	0.05
Age 25-44	-0.01	0.03	-0.01	0.03
Age 45-64	0.25**	0.03	0.25**	0.03
Age65+	0.44**	0.04	0.44**	0.04
High School	0.36**	0.03	0.36**	0.03
Some college	0.64**	0.03	0.64**	0.03
College	0.95**	0.04	0.96**	0.04
Graduate School	1.05**	0.05	1.05**	0.05
Household income	0.03**	0.004	0.03**	0.003
Married	0.27**	0.02	0.27**	0.02
Female	0.09**	0.01	0.09**	0.01
Battleground state	0.16**	0.04	0.16**	0.04
Competitive race	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.06
Employed	0.08	0.05	0.08	0.05
Member of workforce	0.0003	0.05	0.003	0.05
Native-born citizen	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08
Moved within past 6 months	-0.28**	0.03	-0.28**	0.03
Constant	-0.23*	0.11	-0.24**	0.10
Pseudo-R-Squared	.10		.10	

Notes: N = 44,760 registered voters

$p < .05^*$ $p < .01^{**}$ (one-tailed tests)

Models were estimated with robust standard errors to correct for correlated error terms within each state.

Data source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, Voting and Registration Supplement, November 2004

Table 7. Probit model of turnout for Hispanic voters.

	Maximum Requirements		Minimum Requirements	
Variable	**Unstandardized Estimate**	**Standard Error**	**Unstandardized Estimate**	**Standard Error**
Sign name	-0.20	0.20	-0.19	0.11
Match signature	-0.12	0.20	-0.18	0.12
Non-photo ID	-0.40*	0.20	-0.38**	0.13
Photo ID	-0.13	0.23	----	----
Affidavit	----	----	-0.25	0.16
Age 25-44	0.11	0.09	0.11	0.09
Age 45-64	0.35**	0.10	0.36**	0.10
Age65+	0.38**	0.11	0.40**	0.11
High School	0.18**	0.08	0.19*	0.08
Some college	0.46**	0.07	0.46**	0.07
College	0.63**	0.11	0.64**	0.11
Graduate School	0.72**	0.13	0.73**	0.13
Household income	0.03**	0.01	0.03**	0.01
Married	0.05	0.06	0.05	0.06
Female	0.09*	0.04	0.09*	0.04
Battleground state	0.31**	0.06	0.36**	0.07
Competitive race	-0.06	0.13	-0.05	0.13
Employed	0.13	0.12	0.14	0.12
Member of workforce	0.07	0.13	0.08	0.13
Native-born citizen	-0.18**	0.07	-0.20**	0.07
Moved within past 6 months	-0.38**	0.08	-0.39**	0.08
Constant	0.22	0.27	0.21	0.20
Pseudo-R-Squared	0.08		0.08	

Notes: N = 2,860 registered voters

$p < .05$* $p < .01$** (one-tailed tests)

Models were estimated with robust standard errors to correct for correlated error terms within each state.

Data source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, Voting and Registration Supplement, November 2004

023033

Table 6. Probit model of turnout for African-American voters.

	Maximum Requirements		Minimum Requirements	
Variable	**Unstandardized Estimate**	**Standard Error**	**Unstandardized Estimate**	**Standard Error**
Sign name	-0.13	0.09	-0.08	0.13
Match signature	-0.05	0.10	-0.17	0.13
Non-photo ID	-0.24**	0.07	-0.14	0.12
Photo ID	-0.10	0.12	----	----
Affidavit	----	----	-0.05	0.19
Age 25-44	-0.004	0.09	-0.004	0.09
Age 45-64	0.12	0.09	0.13	0.09
Age65+	0.30**	0.12	0.31**	0.12
High School	0.24**	0.06	0.25**	0.06
Some college	0.40**	0.07	0.40**	0.07
College	0.69**	0.08	0.68**	0.08
Graduate School	0.99**	0.19	0.98**	0.19
Household income	0.04**	0.01	0.05**	0.008
Married	0.11	0.07	0.11	0.07
Female	0.14**	0.04	0.14**	0.04
Battleground state	0.13*	0.07	0.21**	0.08
Competitive race	-0.10	0.07	-0.16	0.10
Employed	-0.09	0.11	-0.09	0.10
Member of workforce	-0.32**	0.12	-0.31**	0.11
Native-born citizen	0.31**	0.11	0.28**	0.12
Moved within past 6 months	-0.32**	0.06	-0.32**	0.06
Constant	0.16	0.18	0.12	0.17
Pseudo-R-Squared	0.09		0.09	

Notes: N = 5,013 registered voters

$p < .05$* $p < .01$** (one-tailed tests)

Models were estimated with robust standard errors to correct for correlated error terms within each state.

Data source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, Voting and Registration Supplement, November 2004

Table 8. Probit model of turnout for Asian-American voters.

	Maximum Requirements		Minimum Requirements	
Variable	**Unstandardized Estimate**	**Standard Error**	**Unstandardized Estimate**	**Standard Error**
Sign name	-0.37**	0.20	-0.26	0.17
Match signature	-0.17	0.22	-0.01	0.21
Non-photo ID	-0.40**	0.21	-0.28*	0.16
Photo ID	-0.30	0.21	----	----
Affidavit	----	----	0.12	0.30
Age 25-44	-0.11	0.23	-0.10	0.23
Age 45-64	0.06	0.26	0.08	0.26
Age65+	0.14	0.36	0.17	0.34
High School	0.54**	0.21	0.55**	0.21
Some college	0.36	0.31	0.36	0.31
College	0.67**	0.22	0.66**	0.23
Graduate School	0.57*	0.25	0.55*	0.26
Household income	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
Married	0.34**	0.13	0.34**	0.13
Female	0.16*	0.09	0.16*	0.08
Battleground state	0.29*	0.14	0.23	0.16
Competitive race	0.33*	0.19	0.27	0.22
Employed	-0.24	0.33	-0.25	0.33
Member of workforce	-0.54	0.35	-0.55	0.35
Native-born citizen	0.14	0.12	0.16	0.11
Moved within past 6 months	-0.38*	0.17	-0.39*	0.17
Constant	0.36	0.52	0.29	0.51
Pseudo-R-Squared	0.08		0.08	

Notes: N = 912 registered voters

$p < .05$* $p < .01$** (one-tailed tests)

Models were estimated with robust standard errors to correct for correlated error terms within each state.

Data source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, Voting and Registration Supplement, November 2004

Appendix

Table A-1. Predictors of 2004 turnout at the county level taking into account maximum voter identification requirements treated as a continuous variable.		
Variable	**Unstandardized Estimate**	**Standard Error**
Intercept	-1.33**	0.14
Voter Identification Requirements	-0.01**	0.004
Battleground State	0.04**	0.01
Competitive Senate/Governor's Race	0.04**	0.01
% African-American	0.02	0.01
% Hispanic	-0.05**	0.01
% Age 65 or older	0.82**	0.03
Median Household Income	0.18**	0.01
Registration Closing Date	-0.002**	0.001
-2 Log Likelihood	-8970.1	
Coefficients are restricted maximum likelihood estimates. N = 3,111. * p < .05 ** p < .01 (one-tailed tests).		

Table A-2. Predictors of 2004 turnout at the county level taking into account maximum voter identification requirements and interactions.		
Variable	**Unstandardized Estimate**	**Standard Error**
Intercept	-1.39**	0.14
Sign Name	-0.02	0.013
Match Signature	-0.03*	0.02
Non-photo ID	-0.05**	0.01
Photo Identification	-0.05**	0.02
Battleground State	0.04**	0.01
Competitive Senate/Governor's Race	0.04**	0.01
% African-American	-0.02	0.03
% Hispanic	-0.22**	0.10
% Age 65 or older	0.8**	0.03
Median Household Income	0.18**	0.01
Registration Closing Date	-0.002**	0.001
Signature*African-American	0.02	0.04
Match Signature*African-American	0.16**	0.07
Non-photo ID*African-American	0.03	0.03
Photo ID*African-American	0.20**	0.05
Signature*Hispanic	0.14	0.09
Match Signature*Hispanic	-0.01	0.11
Non-photo ID*Hispanic	0.20**	0.09
Photo ID*Hispanic	0.03	0.11
-2 Log Likelihood	-8966.7	
Coefficients are restricted maximum likelihood estimates. N = 3,111. * p < .05 ** p < .01 (one-tailed tests).		

Table A-3. Predictors of 2004 turnout at the county level taking into account minimum voter identification requirements and interactions.		
Variable	**Unstandardized Estimate**	**Standard Error**
Intercept	-1.39**	0.14
Sign Name	0.0003	0.016
Match Signature	-0.001	0.02
Non-photo ID	-0.02	0.02
Affidavit	-0.02	0.02
Battleground State	0.04**	0.01
Competitive Senate/Governor's Race	0.04**	0.02
% African-American	-0.02	0.02
% Hispanic	-0.19**	0.08
% Age 65 or older	0.82**	0.03
Median Household Income	0.18**	0.01
Registration Closing Date	-0.003**	0.001
Signature*African-American	-0.007	0.03
Match Signature*African-American	0.15**	0.05
Non-photo ID*African-American	0.04	0.03
Affidavit*African-American	0.18**	0.05
Signature*Hispanic	0.12	0.08
Match Signature*Hispanic	-0.03	0.11
Non-photo ID*Hispanic	0.17*	0.08
Affidavit*Hispanic	-0.04	0.10
-2 Log Likelihood	-8960.8	
Coefficients are restricted maximum likelihood estimates. N = 3,111. * p < .05 ** p < .01 (one-tailed tests).		

Table A-4. Probit model of voter turnout treating maximum voter identification requirements as a continuous variable.

Variable	Unstandardized Estimate	Standard Error
Voter Identification Requirements	-0.04**	0.02
Hispanic	-0.09	0.05
African-American	0.24**	0.04
Asian-American	-0.38**	0.07
Age 25-44	0.005	0.02
Age 45-64	0.26**	0.03
Age65+	0.43**	0.03
High School	0.31**	0.02
Some college	0.57**	0.03
College	0.87**	0.04
Graduate School	0.98**	0.05
Household income	0.03**	0.003
Married	0.23**	0.02
Female	0.10**	0.01
Battleground state	0.19**	0.04
Competitive race	0.04	0.05
Employed	0.05	0.05
Member of workforce	-0.05	0.05
Native-born citizen	0.02	0.04
Moved within past 6 months	-0.29**	0.03
Constant	-0.08	0.10
Pseudo-R-Squared	0.09	

Notes: N = 54,973 registered voters

$p < .05$* $p < .01$** (one-tailed tests)

Models were estimated with robust standard errors to correct for correlated error terms within each state.

Data source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, Voting and Registration Supplement, November 2004

APPENDIX D

Annotated Bibliography on Voter Identification Issues

Law Journals

- Angelo J. Genova & Rebecca Moll Freed, *The Right to Vote and Be Counted: A Liberty at Risk*, 233 N.J. LAW 44, Apr. 2005.
  - Discusses HAVA a lot
- George W. Grayson, *Registering and Identifying Voters: What the United States Can Learn From Mexico,* 3 ELECTION L.J. 513 (2004).
  - Benefits of US adopting Mexican system of identifying voters and voter registration
- Robert A. Pastor, *Improving the U.S. Electoral System: Lessons from Canada and Mexico,* 3 ELECTION L.J. 584 (2004).
  - Discusses HAVA, problems of 2000 election, discusses registration & identification
- Brian Kim, *Recent Development: Help America Vote Act,* 40 HARV. J. ON LEGIS. 579 (Summer 2003).
  - Discussion of HAVA requirements and voter ID, problems in 2000
- Robert L. McCurley, *Legislative Wrap-Up: Election Law Changes*, 64 ALA. LAW. 364, Nov. 2003.
  - Discusses changes in AL to their election law in 2003, including adding voter ID
  - HAVA discussed
- Clifford B. Levine, Esq. & David J. Montgomery, Esq., *Post-Election Litigation in Pennsylvania,* 41 Duq. L. Rev. 153 (Fall, 2002).
  - Discusses challenging elections based on voter fraud & illegal votes
- Rebecca Barrett, *Election,* 18 GA. ST. U. L. REV. 114 (Fall 2001).
  - Discusses a GA law in 2001 removing hunting & fishing licenses from list of acceptable ID and a failed amendment to limit acceptable ID to photo ID only
- Robert A. Junell, Curtis L. Seidlits, Jr. & Glen G. Shuffler, *Consideration of Illegal Votes in Legislative Election Contests,* 28 Tex. Tech L. Rev. 1095 (1997).
  - General discussion of ways voters are verified, what happens when voters are challenged as illegal voters
- John Victor Berry, *Take the Money and Run: Lame-Ducks "Quack" and Pass Voter Identification Provisions,* 74 U. DET. MERCY L. REV. 291 (Winter 1997).
  - discusses a photo ID law passed in Michigan in 1997 (later declared violated EPC of 14th amendment)
  - arguments against photo ID
- Deborah S. James, Note, *Voter Registration: A Restriction on the Fundamental Right to Vote,* 96 YALE L.J. 1615 (1987).
  - Discusses voter registration as a way to combat fraud & several different ways to do it

Historical articles:

- Gabrielle B. Ruda, Note, *Picture Perfect: A Critical Analysis of the Debate on the 2002 Help America Vote Act,* 31 FORDHAM URB. L.J. 235 (November 2003).
  - Lot of analysis on HAVA and voter ID
  - Little bit of historical
  - Arguments for and against certain types of voter ID laws

- Kimberly C. Delk, *What Will it Take to Produce Greater American Voter Participation? Does Anyone Really Know?,* 2 LOY. J. PUB. INT. L. 133 (Spring 2001).
    - History of voting & requirements & laws throughout time
    - Future: I-voting & e-registration – improvements in voter ID which would result

Marginally relevant/limited discussion of Voter ID issues

- Jeanne S. Zaino & Jeffrey T. Zaino, *The Changing Landscape of Election Disputes,* 59 DISP. RESOL. J. 11 (Aug. – Oct. 2004).
    - Discusses HAVA & implementation
- Symposium, *Disability Law, Equality, and Difference: American Disability Law and the Civil Rights Model, Alabama Section*, 55 ALA. L. REV. 1167 (Summer 2004).
    - Discusses an AL law expanding exemptions to ID requirement if 2 poll workers identify them
- Bryan Mercurio, *Democracy in Decline: Can Internet Voting Save the Electoral Process,* 22 J. MARSHALL J. COMPUTER & INFO. L. 409 (Winter 2004).
    - Internet voting
- Kristen E. Larson, Note, *Cast Your Ballot.com: Fulfill Your Civic Duty over the Internet,* 27 WM. MITCHELL L. REV. 1797 (2001).
    - Voter ID and Internet voting
    - Costs & Benefits of Internet voting
    - States using or examining Internet voting
- Hugh M. Lee, *An Analysis of State and Federal Remedies for Election Fraud, Learning from Florida's Presidential Election Debacle?,* 63 U. Pitt. L. Rev. 159 (Fall, 2001).
    - Discusses illegal ballots, fraudulent registration
- Katharine Hickel Barondeau & Terry M. Jarrett, *The Florida Election Debacle: Can it Happen in Missouri?,* 57 J. Mo. B. 294, Nov./Dec. 2001.
    - Anti fraud election reform in Missouri
- Priscilla L. Southwell & Justin Burchett, *Vote-by-Mail in the State of Oregon,* 34 Willamette L. Rev. 345 (Spring 1998).
    - Vote by mail and discusses fraud issues involved
- Jonathan E. Davis, *Comment: The National Voter Registration Act of 1993: Debunking States' Rights Resistance and the Pretense of Voter Fraud,* 6 Temp. Pol. & Civ. Rts. L. Rev. 117 (Fall 1996/Spring 1997).
    - Voter fraud arguments against NVRA
- James A. Gardner, *Consent, Legitimacy and Elections: Implementing Popular Sovereignty Under the Lockean Constitution,* 52 U. PITT. L. REV. 189 (Fall 1990).
    - History of voting and requirements
    - Theory

Political Science Literature

Abramson, Paul R. "Political Participation." In *The Encyclopedia of Democracy.* Ed. Seymour Martin Lipset. Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly, 1995.

Aldrich, John H. "Rational Choice and Turnout." *American Journal of Political Science.* 37:1 (February 1993).

Arvizu, John R. and F. Chris Garcia. "Latino Voting Participation: Explaining and Differentiating Latino Voter Turnout." *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences.* 18:2 (May 1996).

Barber, Benjamin R. *Strong Democracy: Participatory Politics for a New Age.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1984.

Blais, Andre. *To Vote or Not to Vote? The Merits and Limits of Rational Choice Theory.* Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2000.

Blais, Andre and Robert Young. "Why Do People Vote? An Experiment in Rationality." *Public Choice.* 99:1-2 (April 1999).

Bowler, Shaun. David Brockington and Todd Donovan. "Election Systems and Voter Turnout: Experiments in the United States". *The Journal of Politics,* 63:3 (August 2001).

Boyd, Richard W. "The Effects of Primaries and Statewide Races on Voter Turnout." *Journal of Politics.* 51:3 (August 1989).

Brady, Henry E., Sidney Verba, and Kay Lehman Schlozman. "Beyond SES: A Resource Model of Political Participation." *American Political Science Review.* 89:2 (June 1995).

Brians, Craig Leonard. "Voter Registration's Consequences for the Mobile: A Comparative Turnout Study." *Political Research Quarterly.* 50:1 (March 1997).

Brians, Craig Leonard and Bernard Grofman. "Election Day Registration's Effect on U.S. Voter Turnout." *Social Science Quarterly.* 82:1 (March 2001).

------ "When Registration Barriers Fall, Who Votes? An Empirical Test of a Rational Choice Model." *Public Choice.* 99:1-2 (April 1999).

Burnham, Walter Dean. "The Appearance and Disappearance of the American Voter." In *Electoral Participation: A Comparative Analysis.* Ed. Richard Rose. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1980.

Cassel, Carol A. and Robert C. Luskin. "Simple Explanations of Turnout Decline." *American Political Science Review.* 82:4 (December 1988).

Castanheira, Micael. "Victory Margins and the Paradox of Voting." *European Journal of Political Economy.* 19:4 (November 2003).

Center for the Study of the American Electorate. "2004 Election Report". 4 November 2004. Avaliable online at ????????.

Cho, Wendy K. Tam. "Naturalization, Socialization, Participation: Immigrants and (Non-) Voting." *Journal of Politics.* 61:4 (November 1999).

Crewe, Ivor. "Electoral Participation." In *Democracy at the Polls: A Comparative Study of Competitive National Elections.* Eds. David Butler, Howard R. Penniman, and Austin Ranney. Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute, 1981.

Franklin, Mark N. "Electoral Participation." In *Comparing Democracies: Elections and Voting in Global Perspective.* Eds. Laurence Le Duc, Richard G. Niemi, and Pippa Norris. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications; 1996.

Franklin, Mark N., Cees van der Eijk, and Erik Oppenhuis. "The Institutional Context: Turnout." In *Choosing Europe? The European Electorate and National Politics in the Face of Union.* Eds. Cees van der Eijk and Mark N. Franklin. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1996.

Gerber, Alan S., Donald P. Green, and Matthew Green. "Partisan Mail and Voter Turnout: Results from Randomized Field Experiments." *Electoral Studies.* 22:4 (December 2003).

Gerber, Alan S., Donald P. Green, and Ron Shachar. "Voting May Be Habit-Forming: Evidence from a Randomized Field Experiment." *American Journal of Political Science.* 47:3 (July 2003).

Gimpel, James G., Joshua Dyck, and Daron Shaw. "Registrants, Voters, and Turnout Variability across Neighborhoods." *Political Behavior.* 26:4 (December 2004).

Gimpel, James G. and Jason E. Schuknecht. "Political Participation and the Accessibility of the Ballot Box." *Political Geography.* 22:5 (June 2003).

Gray, Mark and Miki Caul. "Declining Voter Turnout in Advanced Industrial Democracies, 1950 to 1997: The Effects of Declining Group Mobilization." *Comparative Political Studies.* 33:9 (November 2000).

Green, Donald P. and Alan S. Gerber. *Get Out the Vote!: How to Increase Voter Turnout.* Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2004.

Hanmer, M.J. and Michael W. Traugott. "The Impact of Voting by Mail on Voter Behavior." *American Politics Research.* 32:4 (July 2004).

Highton, Benjamin. "Alternative Tests for the Effects of Campaigns and Candidates on Voting Behavior." In *Capturing Campaign Effects.* Eds. Henry Brady and Richard Johnston. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, forthcoming.

------- "Easy Registration and Voter Turnout." *Journal of Politics.* 59:2 (May 1997).

------- "Residential Mobility, Community Mobility, and Voter Turnout." *Political Behavior.* 22:2 (June 2000).

------- "Voter Registration and Turnout in the United States." *Perspectives on Politics.* 2:3 (September 2004).

------ "Who Reports? Self-Reported Versus Proxy-Reported Voter Turnout." *Public Opinion Quarterly.* Forthcoming.

Highton, Benjamin and Arthur Burris. "New Perspectives on Latino Voter Turnout in the United States." *American Politics Research.* 30:3 (May 2002).

Highton, Benjamin and Raymond E. Wolfinger. "Estimating the Effects of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993." *Political Behavior.* 20:2 (June 1998).

------ "The Political Implications of Higher Turnout." *British Journal of Political Science.* 31:1 (January 2001).

Highton, Benjamin, Raymond E. Wolfinger, and Megan Mullin. "How Postregistration Laws Affect the Turnout of Citizens Registered to Vote." *State Politics and Policy Quarterly.* 5:1 (Spring 2005).

Hirczy, Wolfgang. "The Impact of Mandatory Voting Laws on Turnout: A Quasi-Experimental Approach." *Electoral Studies.* 13:1 (March 1994).

Jacobs, Lawrence et al. *American Democracy in an Age of Rising Inequality.* Report of the American Political Science Association's Task Force on Inequality and American Democracy. Available online at http://209.235.207.197/imgtest/taskforcereport.pdf

Jones, Bill. "California's Long Road to Election Reform." *Election Law Journal.* 1:4 (December 2002).

Karp, Jeffrey A. and Susan A. Banducci. "Absentee Voting, Mobilization, and Participation." *American Politics Research.* 29:2 (March 2001).

------ "Going Postal: How All-Mail Elections Influence Turnout." *Political Behavior.* 22:3 (September 2000).

Kelley, Stanley, Richard E. Ayres, and William G. Bowen. "Registration and Voting: Putting First Things First." *American Political Science Review.* 61:2 (June 1967).

Kimberling, William C. and Peggy Sims. *Federal Election Law 91: A Summary of Federal Election Laws Pertaining to Registration and Voting.* Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse on Election Administration, Federal Election Commission, 1991.

------- *Federal Election Law 96: A Summary of Federal Election Laws Pertaining to Registration, Voting, and Public Employee Participation.* Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse on Election Administration, Federal Election Commission, 1996.

Kleppner, Paul. *Who Voted?: The Dynamics of Electoral Turnout, 1870- 1980.* New York, NY: Praeger Publishers, 1982.

Knack, Stephen. "Does 'Motor Voter' Work? Evidence from State-Level Data." *Journal of Politics.* 57:3 (August 1995).

------- "Does Rain Help the Republicans? Theory and Evidence on Turnout and the Vote." *Public Choice.* 79:1-2 (April 1994).

Lapp, John A. "Elections—Identification of Voters." *American Political Science Review, 3:1 (February 1909).*

Leighley, Jan E. and Arnold Vedlitz. "Race, Ethnicity, and Political Participation: Competing Models and Contrasting Explanations." *Journal of Politics.* 61:4 (November 1999).

Lijphart, Arend. "The Political Consequences of Electoral Laws, 1945-85." *American Political Science Review.* 84:2 (June 1990).

------- "Unequal Participation: Democracy's Unresolved Dilemma." *American Political Science Review.* 91:1 (March 1997).

Magleby, David B. "Participation in Mail Ballot Elections." *Western Political Quarterly.* 40:1 (March 1987).

Manza, Jeff and Clem Brooks. "The Gender Gap in U.S. Presidential Elections: When? Why? Implications?" *American Journal of Sociology.* 103:5 (March 1998).

------- "The Religious Factor in U.S. Presidential Elections, 1960-1992." *American Journal of Sociology.* 103:1 (July 1997).

------- "Social Cleavages and Political Alignments: U.S. Presidential Elections, 1960-1992." *American Sociological Review.* 62:6 (December 1997).

------- *Social Cleavages and Political Change: Voter Alignments and U.S. Party Coalitions.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Martin, Paul. "Voting's Rewards: Voter Turnout, Attentive Publics, and Congressional Allocation of Federal Money." *American Journal of Political Science.* 47:1 (January 2003).

Mattila, Mikko. "Why Bother? Determinants of Turnout in the European Elections." *Electoral Studies.* 22:3 (September 2003).

McDonald, Michael P. "Every Eligible Voter Counts: Correctly Measuring American Turnout Rates." *Brookings Institution Report.* 2004. Available online at http://www.brookings.edu/views/papers/20040909mcdonald.pdf

McDonald, Michael P. and Samuel Popkin. "The Myth of the Vanishing Voter." *American Political Science Review.* 95:4 (December 2001).

Merrifield, John. "The Institutional and Political Factors that Influence Voter Turnout." *Public Choice.* 77:3 (November 1993).

Mitchell, Glenn E. and Christopher Wlezien. "The Impact of Legal Constraints on Voter Registration, Turnout, and the Composition of the American Electorate." *Political Behavior.* 17:2 (June 1995).

Morone, James A. *The Democratic Wish: Popular Participation and the Limits of American Government.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1998.

Nagler, Jonathan. "The Effect of Registration Laws and Education on U.S. Voter Turnout." *American Political Science Review.* 85:4 (December 1991).

Nardulli, Peter F., Dalager, Jon K., and Donald E. Greco. "Voter Turnout in U.S. Presidential Elections: An Historical View and Some Speculation." *PS: Political Science and Politics.* 29:3 (September 1996).

National Research Commission on Election and Voting. "Interim Report on Alleged Irregularities in the United States Presidential Election 2 November 2004." 23 December 2004. Available online at http://elections.ssrc.org/research/InterimReport122204.pdf

Neeley, G.W. and L.E. Richardson. "Who Is Early Voting? An Individual Level Examination." *Social Science Journals.* 38:3 (Autumn 2001).

Oliver, J. Eric. "The Effects of Eligibility Restrictions and Party Activity on Absentee Voting and Overall Turnout." *American Journal of Political Science.* 40:2 (May 1996).

Pacek, Alexander and Benjamin Radcliff. "Turnout and the Vote for Left-of Centre Parties: A Cross-National Analysis." *British Journal of Political Science.* 25:1 (January 1995).

Palfrey, Thomas R. and Howard Rosenthal. "Voter Participation and Strategic Uncertainty." *American Political Science Review.* 79:1 (March 1985).

Pantoja, Adrian D., Ricardo Ramirez, and Gary M. Segura. "Citizens by Choice, Voters by Necessity: Patterns in Political Mobilization by Naturalized Latinos." *Political Research Quarterly.* 54:4 (December 2001).

Patterson, Thomas E. *The Vanishing Voter.* New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf, 2002.

Piven, Frances Fox and Richard A. Cloward. *Why Americans Don't Vote.* New York, NY: Pantheon Books, 1988.

Phillips, Kevin P. and Paul H. Blackman. *Electoral Reform and Voter Participation: Federal Registration, a False Remedy for Voter Apathy.* Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1975.

Plutzer, Eric. "Becoming a Habitual Voter: Inertia, Resources and Growth in Young Adulthood." *American Political Science Review.* 96:1 (March 2002).

Powell, G. Bingham, Jr. "American Voter Turnout in Comparative Perspective." *American Political Science Review.* 80:1 (March 1986).

------- *Contemporary Democracies: Participation, Stability, and Violence.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982.

------- "Constitutional Design and Citizen Electoral Control." *Journal of Theoretical Politics.* 1:2 (April 1989).

------- "Voting Turnout in Thirty Democracies: Partisan, Legal, and Socio-Economic Influences." In *Electoral Participation: A Comparative Analysis.* Ed. Richard Rose. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1980.

Rallings, C., M. Thrasher and G. Borisyuk. "Seasonal Factors, Voter Fatigue and the Costs of Voting." *Electoral Studies.* 22:1 (March 2003).

Rosenstone, Steven J. and John Mark Hansen. *Mobilization, Participation, and Democracy in America.* New York, NY: Macmillan, 1993.

Rosenstone, Steven J. and Raymond E. Wolfinger. "The Effect of Registration Laws on Voter Turnout." *American Political Science Review.* 72:1 (March 1978).

Rusk, Jerrold G. "The Effect of the Australian Ballot Reform on Split Ticket Voting: 1876 – 1908." *American Political Science Review.* 64:4 (December 1970).

Shaw, Daron, Rodolfo O. de la Garza, and Jongho Lee. "Examining Latino Turnout in 1996: A Three-State, Validated Survey Approach." *American Journal of Political Science.* 44:2 (April 2000).

Southwell, Priscilla L. and Burchett, Justin I. "The Effect of All-Mail Elections on Voter Turnout." *American Politics Quarterly.* 28:1 (January 2000).

Squire, Peverill, Raymond E. Wolfinger, and David P. Glass. "Presidential Mobility and Voter Turnout." *American Political Science Review.* 81:1 (March 1987).

Stein, Robert M. "Introduction: Early Voting (in Research Notes)." *Public Opinion Quarterly.* 62:1 (Spring 1998).

Stein, Robert M. and Patricia A. Garcia-Monet. "Voting Early but Not Often." *Social Science Quarterly.* 78:3 (September 1997).

Timpone, Richard J. "Structure, Behavior, and Voter Turnout in the United States." *American Political Science Review.* 92:1 (March 1998).

Tollison, Robert D. and Thomas D. Willett. "Some Simple Economics of Voting and Not Voting." *Public Choice.* 14:1 (April 1973).

Traugott, Michael W., Adam Berinsky, and Nancy Burns. "Who Votes by Mail?" *Public Opinion Quarterly.* 65:2 (Summer 2001).

Verba, Sidney, Norman H. Nie, and Jae-On Kim. *Participation and Political Equality: A Seven-Nation Comparison.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1978.

Verba, Sidney, Kay Lehman Schlozman, and Henry E. Brady. *Voice and Equality: Civic Volunteerism in American Politics.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995.

Wattenberg, Martin P. "Turnout Decline in the U.S. and Other Advanced Industrial Democracies." *Research Monograph: Center for the Study of Democracy, University of California, Irvine.* September 1998. Available online at http://www.democ.uci.edu/papers/marty.html

Winders, Bill. "The Roller Coaster of Class Conflict: Class Segments, Mass Mobilization, and Voter Turnout in the US., 1840-1996." *Social Forces,* 77:3 (March 1999).

Wolfinger, Raymond E. "The Rational Citizen Faces Election Day or What Rational Choice Theorists Don't Tell You about American Elections." In *Elections at Home and Abroad: Essays in Honor of Warren E. Miller.* Eds. M. Kent Jennings and Thomas E. Mann. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1994.

Wolfinger, Raymond E., David P. Glass, and Peverill Squire. "Predictors of Electoral Turnout: An International Comparison." *Policy Studies Review.* 9:3 (Spring 1990).

Wolfinger, Raymond E. and Steven J. Rosenstone. *Who Votes?* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1980.

Appendix E

State Statutes and Regulations Affecting Voter Identification

Compiled by The Moritz College of Law, The Ohio State University

Available in electronic form

FINAL DRAFT

For Review by the Standards Board and Board of Advisors

Report to the

U. S. Election Assistance Commission

On

Best Practices to Improve Voter Identification Requirements

Pursuant to the

HELP AMERICA VOTE ACT OF 2002

Public Law 107-252

May 16, 2006

Submitted by

The Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

The Moritz College of Law, The Ohio State University

The Research Team

This research report on Voter Identification Requirements in the 2004 election is part of a broader analysis that also includes a study of Provisional Voting, which has already been submitted to the EAC. Conducting the work was a consortium of The Eagleton Institute of Politics of Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, and The Moritz College of Law of The Ohio State University.

The Eagleton Institute explores state and national politics through research, education, and public service, linking the study of politics with its day-to-day practice. It focuses attention on how contemporary political systems work, how they change, and how they might work better. Eagleton regularly undertakes projects to enhance political understanding and involvement, often in collaboration with government agencies, the media, non-profit groups, and other academic institutions.

The Moritz College of Law has served the citizens of Ohio and the nation since its establishment in 1891.It has played a leading role in the legal profession through countless contributions made by graduates and faculty. Its contributions to election law have become well known through its Election Law @ Moritz website. *Election Law @ Moritz* illuminates public understanding of election law and its role in our nation's democracy.

Project Management Team

Dr. Ruth B. Mandel
Director. Eagleton Institute of Politics
Board of Governors Professor of Politics
Principal Investigator
Chair of the Project Management Team

Edward B. Foley
Robert M. Duncan/Jones Day Designated Professor of Law
The Moritz College of Law
Director of Election Law @ Moritz

Ingrid Reed
Director of the New Jersey Project
The Eagleton Institute of Politics

Daniel P. Tokaji
Assistant Professor of Law
The Moritz College of Law

John Weingart
Associate Director
The Eagleton Institute of Politics

Thomas M. O'Neill
Consultant, The Eagleton Institute of Politics
Project Director

Dave Andersen
Graduate Assistant

John Harris
Graduate Assistant
The Eagleton Institute of Politics

Donald Linky
Senior Policy Fellow
The Eagleton Institute of Politics

Sara A. Sampson
Reference Librarian,
Moritz College of Law

Tim Vercellotti
Assistant Research Professor
Assistant Director, Center for Public Interest Polling
The Eagleton Institute

Laura Williams
The Moritz College of Law

Peer Review Group

A draft of this report and the statistical analysis in its appendix were critiqued by a Peer Review Group. The comments of its members improved the quality of our work. While the Group as a whole and the comments of its members individually contributed generously to the research effort, any errors of fact or weaknesses in inference are the responsibility of the Eagleton-Moritz research team. The members of the Peer Review Group do not necessarily share the views reflected in our recommendations.

R. Michael Alvarez
Professor of Political Science
California Institute of Technology

John C. Harrison
Massee Professor of Law
University of Virginia School of Law

Martha E. Kropf
Assistant Professor Political Science
University of Missouri-Kansas City

Daniel H. Lowenstein
Professor of Law, School of Law
University of California at Los Angeles

Timothy G. O'Rourke
Dean, Fulton School of Liberal Arts
Salisbury University

Bradley Smith
Professor of Law
Capital University Law School

Tim Storey
Program Principal
National Conference of State Legislatures

Peter G. Verniero
former Attorney General, State of New Jersey
Counsel, Sills, Cummis, Epstein and Gross, PC

REVISED FINAL DRAFT
For review by the EAC Advisory Boards

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE EAC VOTER IDENTIFICATION ISSUES

Report Background

The Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) (Public Law 107-252) authorizes the United States Election Assistance Commission (EAC) (Sec. 241, 42 USC 15381) to conduct periodic studies of election administration issues. The purpose of these studies is to promote methods for voting and administering elections, including provisional voting, that are convenient, accessible and easy to use; that yield accurate, secure and expeditious voting systems; that afford each registered and eligible voter an equal opportunity to vote and to have that vote counted; and that are efficient.

This study provides information on voter identification practices in the 2004 election. It makes recommendations for best practices to evaluate future proposals for voter ID requirements, including the systematic collection and evaluation of information from the states. The research was conducted by the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, and the Moritz College of Law at the Ohio State University under a contract with the EAC, dated May 24, 2005. The work included a review and legal analysis of state statutes, regulations and litigation concerning voter identification and provisional voting as well as a statistical analysis of the relationship of various requirements for voter identification to turnout in the 2004 election. This report is a companion to a report on Provisional Voting submitted to the EAC on November 28, 2005 under the same contract.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Background and Methods

This report arrives at a time of considerable ferment over the issue of voter identification. The debate across the nation over requiring voters to produce a specific identification document before being permitted to cast a regular (as opposed to a provisional) ballot, has revealed supporters and opponents in polarized camps.

- Proponents of stricter identification requirements base their case on improving the security of the ballot by reducing opportunities for one kind of vote fraud --multiple voting or voting by those who are not eligible. The proponents argue that their goal is to ensure that only those legally entitled to vote do so, and do so only once at each election.

- Opponents seek to forestall more stringent identification requirements, such as for government-issued photo ID, in order to ensure broad access to a regular ballot. They fear that some voters --such as, they argue, racial and ethnic minorities, the young, and elderly voters-- may lack convenient access to the required ID documents, or that such voters may be fearful of submitting their ID documents to official scrutiny and thus stay away from the polls.
- Both sides argue that their preferred policy will engender faith in the electoral process among citizens.

This report considers policy issues associated with the voter ID debate and investigates whether empirical study can suggest a way to estimate the effects of different voter ID requirements on turnout, and important first step in assessing tradeoffs between ballot security and ballot access. The aim is to contribute to the effort to raise the quality of the debate over this contentious topic. The tradeoffs between ballot security and ballot access are crucial. A voting system that requires voters to produce an identity document or documents may prevent the ineligible from voting. It may also prevent eligible voters from casting a ballot. If the ID requirement of a ballot protection system blocks ineligible voters from the polls at the cost of preventing eligible voters who lack the required forms of identification, the integrity of the ballot may not have been improved; the harm may be as great as the benefit.

As part of the project's effort to analyze the relationship between Voter ID requirements, turnout, and their policy implications, a statistical analysis was conducted to examine the potential variation in turnout. This statistical study developed a model to illuminate the relationships between voter ID requirements and turnout. This model's findings and limitations suggest avenues for further research and analysis that may assist the EAC and the states as they explore policies to balance the goals of ballot integrity and ballot access.

The statistical analysis describes one possible way to estimate what might be the incremental effect on voters' access to the ballot of an increase in the rigor of voter identification requirements. We do not offer this statistical analysis as the last word, but rather as a preliminary word on the subject. Its findings must be regarded as tentative; the information that might permit greater certainty is simply not available. Indeed, as our recommendations indicate, the next step to improve understanding of the effects of stricter voter identification on turnout and on vote fraud is to collect more information on both topics systematically and regularly.

Making a statistical estimate of the effect of voting regulations on turnout is difficult. The dynamics of turnout are complex, much studied, and only partially understood. Some agreement exists, however, that three factors that exert substantial influence on voter turnout are:[1] the socioeconomic status of the potential voter; legal requirements to vote; and the political context of the election. By focusing on how voters identify themselves at the polls, this report emphasizes legal requirements. The statistical analysis also consides some of the socioeconomic, racial, and age characteristics of the electorate, as well as the political context in 2004 (such as whether a state was a battleground in the presidential race).

Examining tradeoffs between ballot security and ballot access requires some measure of the effectiveness of voter ID requirements in reducing multiple voting or voting by ineligible voters. The existing evidence on the incidence of vote fraud, especially on the kind of vote fraud that could be reduced by requiring more rigorous voter identification, is not sufficient to evaluate those tradeoffs.[2] Assessing the effectiveness of voter ID as a way to protect the integrity of the ballot should logically include an estimate of the nature and frequency of vote fraud. This research does not include consideration of vote fraud, nor does it estimate the possible effectiveness of various voter ID regimes to counter attempts at vote fraud. Our analysis also cannot take into account how many potential voters who did not turn out under comparatively stricter voter ID requirements might have been ineligible or eligible to vote.

Despite these qualifications regarding the quality of the available data and the limitations of statistical analysis, however, although it used different statistical methods and two different sets of data on turnout in 2004 election, it points to the same general finding. As discussed at greater length in the appendix to this report, stricter voter identification requirements were correlated with reduced turnout in the models employed.[3] As explained below, these models find that a statistically significant relationship exists, even when controlling for other factors (such as whether the election was in a battleground state) that might affect turnout. Without knowing more about the effects of stricter voter ID on reducing multiple voting or voting by ineligible

[1] See, for example, Tom William Rice and Patrick J. Kenney, "Voter Turnout in Presidential Primaries." 1985. Political Behavior, 7: 101-112. Identification requirements are not the only legal restrictions on voting. States also differ, for example, in their registration requirements (including how long before the election registration must take place and the identity documents required register).
[2] The EAC has contracted with other researchers to study vote fraud issues.
[3] Appendix C: Tim Vercellotti, Eagleton Institute of Politics, *Analysis of Effects of Voter Identification Requirements on Turnout.*

voters, however, the tradeoffs between ballot security and ballot access cannot be assessed fully.

Methodology

The report includes detailed information on the nature of the statutory requirements across the country in 2004 and on the statutes and court decisions that provide the legal context for the voter ID debate. We gathered information on the requirements in effect in the 50 states and the District of Columbia in that year. Based on our interpretation of state statutes, supplemented in some cases by conversations with state election officials, we divided the states' ID requirements into five categories. We believe each category is more rigorous than the one preceding, based on the demands they make on voters.[4] The categories range from "Stating Name" which we judge to be somewhat less demanding than "Signing Name." "Signature Match" requires poll workers to examine the signature and compare it to a sample, which is slightly more demanding that the voter simply signing. "Present ID" requires voters to offer some documentary evidence of their identity, ranging from a utility bill to a passport. It is more demanding than the previous three categories because it requires that the voter remember to bring this documentation to the polls. (Even a simple ID, such as a utility bill, may not be available to some renters or, say, those in group housing.) We regard a government "Photo ID" as the most rigorous requirement. Such identity documents may not be uniformly and conveniently available to all voters.

For each state, we identified both the "maximum" and "minimum" identification requirements. The term "maximum" refers to the most that voters may be *asked* to do or show at the polling place (putting aside cases in which particular voter's eligibility may be questioned pursuant to a state challenge process). The term "minimum," on the other hand, refers to the most that voters can be *required* to do or show, in order to cast regular ballot (again leaving aside a state challenge process). We have included "maximum" requirements in our analysis, and not simply "minimum" requirements, because simply asking voters to produce particular identifying information may have a deterrent effect, even if voters are ultimately allowed to cast a regular ballot without that identification. For example, in a state where voters are asked to show photo ID at the polling place, but still allowed to vote by completing an affidavit confirming their eligibility, the "maximum" of being asked to show photo ID may deter some voters even though the "minimum" would allow them to vote without photo ID.

[4] Even the most relaxed provisions for identification at the polls –anything stricter than the honor system used in North Dakota—will impose some burden on particular voters. Harvard Law Review 119:1146

It is worth emphasizing that, at the time of the 2004 election, there was *no* state that had a "minimum" requirement of showing photo ID – in other words, there was no state that required voters to show photo ID in order to cast a regular ballot. For this reason, our report does not measure the impact of laws, like those recently enacted in Indiana and Georgia, which require voters to show photo ID in order to cast a regular ballot without an affidavit exception.

To examine the potential variation on turnout rates associated with each type of voter ID requirements in effect on Election Day 2004, the statistical analysis drew on two sets of data. These were, first, aggregate turnout data at the county level for each state and, second, the reports of individual voters collected in the November 2004 Current Population Survey by the U. S. Census Bureau. Using two different data sets makes it possible to check the validity of one analysis against the other. It also provides insights not possible using only one of the data sets. The aggregate analysis cannot provide valid estimates on the effects of different ID requirements on particular demographic groups (e.g., the old, the young, African-Americans, the poor, or high school graduates). The Current Population Survey data does permit that kind of analysis, although it has the disadvantage of relying on self-reports by respondents about their registration status and experience in the polling place.

To understand legal issues that have been raised in recent litigation over voter ID requirements, we collected and analyzed the few major cases that have been decided so far on this issue. The decisions so far provide some guidance on the constitutional and other constraints as to voter ID requirements.

Summary of Findings

As voter identification requirements vary, voter turnout varies as well. This finding emerged from both the statistical analysis's aggregate data and the individual-level data, although not always for both the maximum and minimum sets of requirements. The overall relationship between the stringency of ID requirements and turnout was fairly small, but still statistically significant.

In the model used with the aggregate data in the statistical analysis, the match signature requirement, the provide a non-photo ID requirement, and the photo ID requirement were all correlated with lower turnout compared to requiring that voters state their names. With the addition of the registration closing data to the aggregate analysis, photo id is no longer a

significant predictor of turnout. Signature match and non-photo id remain significant and negative predictors in the model.

The reduction in turnout was not the same for all demographic groups in the citizen voting age population.

The non-photo identification requirement showed the most significant and consistent correlation with reduced turnout. This result may be surprising given the intense debates surrounding photo identification requirements. The effect of photo ID requirements cannot, however, be assessed from the data the statistical analysis examined, since none of the states had laws in 2004 that conditioned voting on presentation of photo ID. Each of the five states that had photo ID as a "maximum" requirement (i.e., the most that voters could be asked to show at the polls) accepted another type of identification or an affidavit as a "minimum" requirement in the 2004 election (i.e., they were allowed to cast a regular ballot with something less than photo ID).

Significant questions about the relationship of voter identification requirements to turnout remain unanswered. The data examined in this project could not capture the dynamics of how identification requirements might lower turnout. If ID requirements dampen turnout, is it because individuals are aware of the requirements and stay away from the polls because they cannot or do not want to meet the requirements? Or, do the requirements result in some voters being turned away when they cannot meet the requirements on Election Day? Other factors that may also be correlated with stricter ID laws – such as less user-friendly voter registration systems – may actually be causing lower turnout. The CPS data do not include the information needed to answer this question. Knowing more about the "on the ground" experiences of voters concerning identification requirements could guide policy-makers at the state and local level in determining whether and at what point in the electoral cycle a concerted public information campaign might be most effective in helping voters to meet identification requirements. Such knowledge also could help in designing training for election judges to handle questions about, and potential disputes over, voter identification requirements.

Our analysis of litigation suggests that the courts will look more strictly at requirements that voters produce a photo ID in order to cast a regular ballot, than at non-photo ID laws. The courts have used a balancing test to weigh the legitimate interest in preventing election fraud against the citizen's right to privacy (protecting social security numbers from public disclosure, for

example) and the reasonableness of requirements for identity documents. To provide both the clarity and certainty in administration of elections needed to forestall destabilizing challenges to outcomes, a best practice for the states may be to limit requirements for voter identification to the minimum needed to prevent duplicate registration and ensure eligibility.

The current lack of understanding of precisely how voter ID requirements affect turnout could be ameliorated by requiring the collection and reporting of additional data, including the reasons potential voters are required to cast a provisional ballot and the reasons for rejecting provisional ballots during the 2006 and subsequent elections. Also useful would be the results of surveys of voters on their experiences in meeting voter ID requirements and on what type of ballot they cast.[5] And, of course, more information is needed on the incidence and varieties of vote fraud, but that inquiry is outside the scope of this report.

Recommendations for consideration and action by the EAC

The dynamics of Voter ID requirements –how more rigorous voter ID requirements may affect the decision by potential voters to go or stay away from the polls-- are not perfectly understood. This lack of understanding should be recognized in the policy process in the states. The debate over voter ID in the states would be improved by additional research sponsored by the EAC.

The EAC should consider the following actions to improve understanding of the relationship between voter ID requirements and the two important goals of ensuring ballot access and ensuring ballot integrity.

1. Encourage or sponsor further research to clarify the connection between Voter ID requirements and the number of potential voters actually able to cast a ballot that is actually counted.
2. Recommend as a best practice the publication of a "Voting Impact Statement" by states as they assess their voter ID requirements to protect the integrity of the ballot. The analysis will help ensure that efforts to increase ballot security have a neutral effect on electoral participation by eligible voters. The Voter Impact Statement would estimate the number and demographics of 1) eligible, potential voters that may be kept from the polls

[5] Arizona held its first election with its new, stricter ID requirements on March 14, 2006. In at least one county (Maricopa) election officials handed a survey to voters that asked if they knew about the voter identification law and if they did, how they found out about it. Edythe Jensen, "New Voter ID Law Goes Smoothly in Chandler," *Arizona Republic*, March 15, 2006. More surveys of this kind can illuminate the dynamics of voter ID and voting in ways that are not possible now because of insufficient data.

or permitted to cast a provisional ballot by a stricter ID requirement; and 2) and assess the number of ineligible voters who will be prevented from voting by the stricter ID requirements.

3. Encourage or require the states in the 2006 election and beyond, to collect and report reliable, credible information on the relationship between ballot access and ballot security. EAC should publish an analysis of this information to provide a sound factual basis for the states to consider as they estimate the incidence of the kinds of vote fraud that more stringent ID requirements may prevent. The analysis should describe the dynamics of the voter ID process in preserving the security of the ballot. EAC can also use this information to encourage the states to assess the effectiveness of programs to ensure that all eligible voters have required ID and are permitted to vote in future elections. Well-designed longitudinal studies in the states can show the results of changing voter ID requirements on electoral participation over time. The studies should include precinct-level data to provide the fine-grained analysis that can provide a solid foundation for policy.
    I. Useful information could be supplied by state-sponsored surveys of voters by local election officials. It would make clear why those who cast a provisional ballot were found ineligible to cast a regular ballot. The answers would illuminate the frequency with which ID issues divert voters into the provisional ballot line.
    II. Surveys to ask voters what they know about the voter id requirements would also provide useful context for evaluating the effect of various voter ID requirements on electoral participation.
    III. Spot checks by state election officials on how the identification process works at polling places could provide information on how closely actual practice tracks statutory or regulatory requirements. Such reports should be available to the public.
4. Encourage states to examine the time period allowed for voters who cast a provisional ballot because they lacked required ID to return with their identification. In eleven states, voters who had to cast a provisional ballot because they lacked the ID required for a regular ballot were permitted to return later with their ID. Their provision of this ID is the critical step in evaluating the ballots. The length of the period in which the voter may return with ID is important. In setting the time period for return, which now varies among the states from the same day to about two weeks, states should consider three factors:

the convenience of the voter, the total time allowed to evaluate ballots[6], and the safe harbor provision in presidential elections.

5. Recommendations to the states from EAC should reflect current judicial trends. Requirements that voters provide some identifying documentation have been upheld, where photo ID is *not* the only acceptable form. Whether laws requiring photo ID will be upheld is more uncertain.

SUMMARY OF RESEARCH

Background and Approach of the Study

Voter ID requirements are just one set of rules governing voting that may affect turnout. Social scientists have long studied how election rules affect participation in elections. The general view today is that the individual citizen makes the choice of whether the vote in a way similar to other decisions that a rational citizen makes, by comparing costs and benefits. The benefits of voting are fairly stable and hard to specify given the remote probability that any one vote will make a difference in an election. But whatever the benefit as perceived by an individual voter, as the costs of voting (for example, time, hassle, acquisition of information) increase, the likelihood that a citizen will vote decrease. Not all groups in the population calculate the cost of participation in the same way, so that election laws (such as registration or identification requirements) may affect different groups differently.

A short summary of some of the social science literature illustrates what may be a broad consensus that the rules of elections affect turnout, but note the important differences in the details of what groups may be most affected.

- Bowler, Brockington and Donovan in "Election Systems and Voter Turnout: Experiments in the United States". *The Journal of Politics*, 63:3 (August 2001) concluded that electoral systems help shape turnout by altering the benefits perceived by voters. For example, cumulative voting systems have 5% greater turnout than plurality systems
- The effect of registration systems has been the subject of many studies over the last 40 years. Kelley, Ayres, and Bowen in "Registration and Voting: Putting First Things First." *American Political Science Review*. 61:2 (June 1967) found that local variations in the

[6] Our research on provisional voting reveals that states that provide more than a week to evaluate provisional ballots end up counting substantially more of those ballots than states that provide less than a week.

rate of voting are most directly tied to variations in the rate of registering to vote, and that the rate of registering to vote in localities is most directly related to the laws and administration of the registration process. They concluded that the decline in voting over the past 80 years was due, in part, to the rise of registration laws.

- Brians and Grofman in "Election Day Registration's Effect on U.S. Voter Turnout." *Social Science Quarterly.* 82:1 (March 2001), found that relaxing registration laws produces higher turnout. In particular, they observed that relaxing registration laws is more likely to promote voter turnout among those with medium levels of income and education, rather than those at the lowest levels. Highton in "Easy Registration and Voter Turnout," *Journal of Politics.* 59:2 (May 1997), concluded similarly that registration laws affect voter turnout, but also observed that easier registration promotes turnout among those in lower socio-economic status.

- Mitchell and Wlezien. "The Impact of Legal Constraints on Voter Registration, Turnout, and the Composition of the American Electorate," *Political Behavior.* 17:2 (June 1995) agreed that easier registration promotes higher turnout, but also concluded that higher turnout from easier registration would be unlikely to change the composition of the electorate. Nagler in "The Effect of Registration Laws and Education on U.S. Voter Turnout." *American Political Science Review.* 85:4 (December 1991) found that registration laws decrease voter turnout by depressing the eligible electorate, but that lower educated people are not disproportionately impacted by these laws. But Rosenstone and Raymond E. Wolfinger in "The Effect of Registration Laws on Voter Turnout." *American Political Science Review.* 72:1 (March 1978) found that while registration laws did affect both voter turnout and the composition of the electorate, the sharpest effect of these restrictions was felt in the South and among the least educated.
- Squire, Wolfinger, and Glass in "Residential Mobility and Voter Turnout." *American Political Science Review.* 81:1 (March 1987) found that people who move constitute a major demographic group affected by registration laws. They estimated that altering laws to facilitate voting by recently moved people could increase turnout by 9%. Highton in "Residential Mobility, Community Mobility, and Voter Turnout." *Political Behavior.* 22:2 (June 2000) also found that people who move have lower turnout than stable residents, and estimated that the decline was more a result of registration laws than a loss of social connections.

- Highton and Wolfinger in "Estimating the Effects of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993." *Political Behavior.* 20:2 (June 1998) concluded that the Motor Voter laws led to a significant increase in voting; that eliminating voter purges for not voting also increases voting; and that these effects are felt most heavily by the young (under 30) and the mobile (moved within past 2 years). Knack, in "Does 'Motor Voter' Work? Evidence from State-Level Data." *Journal of Politics.*, 57:3 (August 1995), also found that motor voter does lead to increased registration and voting, but that other parts of NVRA of 1993, like mail-in registrations, agency-based registrations, and limitations on voter purges had not been as influential two years after the passage of the act.

While voter ID may not have been the subject of as much research as the registration process, establishing the eligibility of a person to vote has long been part of the electoral process. Voters may have to identify themselves twice in the electoral process: when registering to vote and then when casting a ballot. The pressures felt by the voter arising from the need to check ID, even so simple a check as a signature match, can be greater at the polls on Election Day than at the time of registration. Poll workers may feel under pressure when faced with long lines and limited time.

Voter ID requirements on Election Day

This analysis focuses on ID requirements on Election Day, but with an appreciation that the ID requirements at time of registration and on Election Day are inter-related. [7] The emphasis in this report is on Voter ID requirements on Election Day and afterwards as election judges evaluate provisional ballots. This is the critical period for the electoral system, the time when ballot access and ballot security are in the most sensitive balance.

The report looks at voter ID issues that go beyond the rather narrow identification requirements in HAVA. Much of the current debate in state legislatures over voter ID ranges beyond HAVA to require more rigorous documentation of identity for all would-be voters, not just those who had not registered in person and are casting a ballot for the first time. Current controversies in the states over voter ID seems to have been sparked in part by the HAVA requirements, but goes beyond those requirements, and sets the context for the analysis here.[8]

---

[7] As the Carter-Baker Commission noted, photo ID requirements for in-person voting do little to address the problem of fraudulent registration by mail, especially in states that do not require third-party organizations that register voters to verify ID. Commission on Federal Election Reform, pp 46-47.

[8] Harvard Law Review 119:1127: "Legislators hoping to stiffen their state antifraud laws have taken their cue from identification provisions buried in HAVA."

We recognize that the previously technical, rather dull subject of voter ID requirements has become fiercely partisan and divisive in many states. The polarization of the debate has raised the stakes over this issue, making dispassionate analysis both more valuable and more rare.[9] Voter ID is often described as the critical step in protecting the integrity of the ballot, the process to ensure that the potential voter is eligible and, if eligible, is permitted to cast one ballot and one ballot only. Truly protecting the integrity of the ballot, however, requires a perspective that takes in the entire voting process. It demands more than preventing the ineligible from voting, and should also ensure that all those who are eligible and want to vote can cast a ballot that counts. The protection effort must embrace all forms of voting, including absentee ballots, and consider each step in the process from registration through vote counting.

A voting system that requires voters to produce an identity document or documents may prevent the ineligible from voting. It may also prevent the eligible from casting a ballot. If the ID requirements block ineligible voters from the polls at the cost of preventing eligible voters who cannot obtain or have left at home the required forms of identification, the integrity of the ballot may not have been improved; the harm may be as great as the benefit. Ultimately, a normative evaluation of whether a state should adopt a stricter voter ID requirement (and, if so, what particular form that new requirement should take) will weigh value judgments as well as available factual evidence. Nonetheless, this report has proceeded on the premise that increased understanding of the factual evidence relating to the imposition of voter ID requirements, based on available data and statistical analysis of that data, can help inform the policy process.

Assessing the effectiveness of voter ID as a way to protect the integrity of the ballot should logically include an estimate of the nature and frequency of vote fraud. The EAC has commissioned a separate analysis of the incidence of vote fraud. Consequently, this research does not include consideration of vote fraud nor the possible effectiveness of various voter ID regimes to counter attempts at vote fraud. As a result, our study of the possible effects of voter

[9] "Of the various electoral procedure laws passed in the fifty states since the 2000 and 2004 presidential elections and those still being debated in state legislatures and local media, few arouse more potent partisan feelings than voter identification laws." *Harvard Law Review* 119:1144. John Fund's 2004 book, *Stealing Elections: How Voter Fraud Threaten Our Democracy*, cites (pages 16 – 17) a Rasmussen Research poll that asked respondents if they were more concerned with voting by ineligible participants or with disenfranchisement of eligible voters. Sixty-two percent of Kerry supporters, but only 18 percent of Bush supporters, worried more about *disenfranchisement*; 58 percent of Bush supporters, but only 19 percent of Kerry supporters were more concerned with *voter fraud*.

ID requirements on turnout cannot take into account how many potential voters who did not turn out under comparatively stricter voter ID requirements might have been ineligible or eligible to vote.

In some states, voters lacking required ID, or who have ID that does not reflect their current address, are able to vote only by casting a provisional ballot.[10] Voter ID requirements that require voters to bring a document to the polls --rather than simply sign their names-- may divert more voters to the provisional ballot. Requiring poll workers to request and check ID, can put stress on the already demanding environment of the polling place. Scrutiny of ID can create lines at the polling places. Further delays can result when voters cast a provisional ballot and fill out the ballot envelope. Voters who cast a provisional ballot because they lack their ID on Election Day, and who then fail to return with the needed document or documents, will have their ballot rejected.[11] And, of course, the cost of processing provisional ballots is greater than the cost of regular ballots.

Each of these potential consequences of more elaborate voter identification processes can increase the chance of litigation. Long lines will, at best, discourage voters and at worst make voting seem a hassle, an impression that could keep more citizens (even those with ID) from the polls.

Evaluating the effect of different Voter ID regimes can be most effective when based on clear standards --legal, equitable, practical. The standards outlined here might be described as questions policy-makers should ask about Voter ID requirements. We suggest 7 questions that address important dimensions of the problem.

1. Is the Voter ID system designed on the basis of valid and reliable empirical studies of the incidence of the sorts of vote fraud it is designed to prevent?[12]

---

[10] For example, the Florida voter ID law adopted after the 2004 election and pre-cleared by the Department of Justice, permits voters who cannot meet the ID requirements to sign an affidavit on the envelope of a provisional ballot, which will be counted if the signature matches that on the voter's registration form.

[11] The EAC's Election Day Study found "improper ID," to be the third most common reason for a provisional ballot to be rejected. "Improper ID" was cited by 7 states responding to the survey, compared to 14 mentions for voting in the wrong precinct. *Election Day Study*, Chapter 6, p. 5.

[12] "Often where the battle over voter identification is most heated, real evidence of voter fraud proves scarce: in Georgia, for example, the Secretary of State averred that she had never encountered a single instance of voter impersonation at the polls. State laws might sometimes impose tighter restrictions on in-person voting than on absentee ballots, which yield the greatest incidence of, and provide the easiest avenue for, voter fraud. . ." Harvard Law Review 127:1144 (2006)

2. How effective is the ID requirement in increasing the security of the ballot? How well can it be coordinated with a statewide voter database?[13]
3. How practical is the requirement? (Can it be administered smoothly by the staff and budget likely to be made available? How much additional training of polling place workers might be required?) Is it simple enough or can it be defined with sufficient clarity that poll workers throughout the state can administer it uniformly and with a minimum of local interpretation made on the fly under the pressure of Election Day?[14]
4. How cost-effective is the system? Does it demonstrably increase the security of the ballot affordably, measured in both monetary and other costs? To improve understanding of the non-monetary component of the costs, conducting a voter impact study might be appropriate. The voter impact study would examine, before the adoption of the regulation, the cost of compliance by the voter (such as the cost in time and money of acquiring a photo ID card), any offsetting benefits to voters, and the possible disparate effects of the regulation on various groups of voters.[15] A thorough, objective impact statement that demonstrated the nexus between the identification regime and the integrity of the ballot could provide protection against inevitable legal challenges.
5. If a side effect of the Voter ID regulation is likely to reduce turnout, generally or among particular groups, is it possible to take other steps to ameliorate the adverse consequences?[16]
6. Does it comply with the letter and spirit of Voting Rights Act?
7. The seventh question is the most difficult to answer. How neutral is the effect of the Voter ID requirement on the composition of the qualified and eligible electorate? Might it,

---

[13] See the final section of this report for a brief overview of possible effects of a statewide voter database on voter identification issues.

[14] In New York, in 2004, disparities in training and voting information were made apparent in a study finding elections officials had wildly varying interpretations of what the state's voter identification requirement actually was. Tova Wang, "Warning Bell in Ohio," December 5, 2005. Website, the Foundation for National Progress.

[15] "Absent clear empirical evidence demonstrating widespread individual voter fraud, legislatures need to fashion narrowly tailored voter identification provisions with an eye toward the inevitable and well-grounded constitutional challenges that will arise in the courts. Only as states grow more adept at administering elections will courts likely demonstrate greater willingness to uphold strict identification requirements." Harvard Law Review 127:1144 (2006)

[16] For example, the Carter-Baker Commission coupled its recommendation for a national voter ID card to a call for an affirmative effort by the states to reach out and register the unregistered, that is, to use the new Voter ID regime as a means to enroll more voters. Similarly, Richard Hasen has suggested combining a national voter ID with universal registration. See his "Beyond the Margin of Litigation: Reforming U.S. Election Administration to Avoid Electoral Meltdown," 62 Washington and Lee Law Review 937 (2005).

intentionally or unintentionally, reduce the turnout of particular groups of voters or supporters of one party or another without an offsetting decrease in vote fraud?

Voter ID and Turnout

Based on research for this study by the Moritz College of Law, states had one of five types of maximum requirements in place on Election Day 2004.These are shown in Table 1, *Voter ID Requirements*. The five categories: at the polling place, voters were asked to either: state their names (10 states); sign their names (13 states and the District of Columbia); sign their names, to be matched to a signature on file (seven states); provide a form of identification that did not necessarily include a photo (15 states); or provide a photo identification (five states).[17] Using this information made it possible to code the states according to these requirements, and examine the assumption that voter identification requirements would pose an increasingly demanding requirement in this order: stating one's name, signing one's name, matching one's signature to a signature on file, providing a form of identification, and providing a form of photo identification, however, in all "photo ID" states in 2004, voters without photo ID could cast a regular ballot after signing an affidavit concerning their identity and eligibility or provide other forms of ID). The report refers to this set of ID requirements as "maximum," the most rigorous ID the voter can be asked to present at the polling place in order to cast a regular ballot.[18]

Election laws in several states offer exceptions to these requirements if potential voters lack the necessary form of identification. Laws in those states set a minimum standard – that is the minimum requirement that a voter may be required to satisfy in order to vote using a regular ballot. States can be categorized based on the minimum requirement for voting with a regular ballot. In 2004 the categories were somewhat different compared to the maximum requirement, in that none of the states required photo identification as a minimum standard for voting with a regular ballot. That is, voters who lacked photo ID would still be allowed to vote in all states, if able to meet another requirement. Four states required voters to swear an affidavit as to their identity (Florida, Indiana, Louisiana, and North Dakota). The five categories for minimum requirements were: state name (12 states), sign name (14 states and the District of Columbia), match one's signature to a signature on file (six states), provide a non-photo identification (14 states), or swear an affidavit (four states). The analysis also examined this array of minimum

[17] Oregon conducts elections entirely by mail. Voters sign their mail-in ballots, and election officials match the signatures to signatures on file. For the purposes of this analysis, Oregon is classified as a state that requires a signature match.

[18] As noted above, our analysis does not consider additional requirements that particular voters may be subjected to as part of an official challenge process, in the event that their eligibility is called into question.

identification requirements to assess how they correlated with turnout: state name, sign name, match signature, provide non-photo identification, and, given the potential legal consequences for providing false information, swearing an affidavit. As noted above, *no* state had a "minimum" requirement of showing photo ID. This analysis therefore cannot estimate the effect of laws, such as those recently enacted in Indiana and Georgia that require voters to show photo ID in order to cast a regular ballot without an affidavit or other exception.

We recognize the difficulties in summarizing each state's voter ID requirements. The problem is illustrated by the number of footnotes to Table 1 below. The variety of statutory and regulatory details among the states is complex.

Moving beyond the statutes and regulations, we also recognize that the assignment of each state to one category may fail to reflect actual practice at many polling places. As in any system run by fallible humans, the voter ID process is subject to variation in practice.[19] Voters may have been confronted with demands for identification different from the directives in state statutes or regulation. It seems reasonable to conclude, however, that while actual practices may vary, the variance is around each state's legal requirement for ID. The analysis of the effect of state requirements on turnout must be viewed with some caution. We believe that the categories used in this report provide an acceptable level of discrimination among voter identification regimes.

[19] One state election official told us that, "We have 110 election jurisdictions in Illinois, and I have reason to believe [the voter ID requirements] are administered little bit differently in each one. We wish it weren't that way, but it probably is."

TABLE 1 – Voter ID Requirements[20]

State	Maximum Forms of ID Required 2004	Current ID Requirement for First-Time Voters	Current ID Requirements for All Other Voters	Verification Method for Provisional Ballots
Alabama	Provide ID	Provide ID	Provide ID	Address & Registration
Alaska	Provide ID	Provide ID	Provide ID	Signature
Arizona	Provide ID	Gov-issued Photo ID	Gov-issued Photo ID[1]	Address & Registration
Arkansas	Provide ID	Provide ID	Provide ID	Address & Registration
California	Sign Name	Sign Name	Sign Name	Signature
Colorado	Provide ID	Provide ID	Provide ID	Address & Registration
Connecticut	Provide ID	Provide ID	Provide ID	Affidavit
D.C.	Sign Name	Provide ID*	Sign Name	Address & Registration
Delaware	Provide ID	Provide ID	Provide ID	Affidavit
Florida	Photo ID[2]	Photo ID	Photo ID	Signature
Georgia	Provide ID	Gov. Issued Photo ID	Gov. Issued Photo ID	Affidavit
Hawaii	Photo ID^^	Photo ID	Photo ID^^	Affidavit
Idaho	Sign Name	Provide ID*	Sign Name	EDR
Illinois	Give Name	Provide ID*	Match Sig.	Affidavit
Indiana	Sign Name	Gov. Issued Photo ID	Gov. Issued Photo ID	Bring ID Later
Iowa	Sign Name	Provide ID*	Sign Name	Bring ID Later
Kansas	Sign Name	Sign Name	Sign Name	Bring ID Later
Kentucky	Provide ID	Provide ID	Provide ID	Affidavit
Louisiana	Photo ID	Photo ID	Photo ID^	DOB and Address
Maine	Give Name	Provide ID*	Give Name	EDR
Maryland	Sign Name	Provide ID*	Sign Name	Bring ID Later
Mass.	Give Name	Provide ID*	Give Name	Affidavit
Michigan	Sign Name	Provide ID*	Sign Name	Bring ID Later
Minnesota	Sign Name	Provide ID*	Sign Name	EDR
Mississippi	Sign Name	Provide ID*	Sign Name	Affidavit
Missouri	Provide ID	Provide ID*	Provide ID	Address & Registration
Montana	Provide ID	Provide ID*	Provide ID	Bring ID Later
Nebraska	Sign Name	Provide ID*	Sign Name	Affidavit
Nevada	Match Sig.	Provide ID*	Match Sig.	Affidavit
New Jersey	Match Sig.	Provide ID*	Match Sig.	Bring ID Later
New Mexico	Sign Name	Provide ID	Provide ID	Bring ID Later
New York	Match Sig.	Provide ID*	Match Sig.	Affidavit
NH	Give Name	Provide ID	Give Name	EDR
North Carolina	Give Name	Provide ID*	Give Name	Varies
North Dakota	Provide ID	Provide ID	Provide ID	No Registration
Ohio	Match Sig.	Provide ID	Provide ID	Address & Registration
Oklahoma	Sign Name	Provide ID*	Sign Name	Address & Registration
Oregon	Match Sig.	Provide ID*	Match Sig.	Signature
Penn.	Match Sig.	Provide ID[4]	Match Sig.	Address & Registration
Rhode Island	Give Name	Provide ID*	Give Name	Address & Registration

[20] See Appendix 1 for a more detailed summary, including citations and statutory language, of the identification requirements in each state.

South Carolina	Photo ID[5]	Photo ID	Photo ID^^	Address & Registration
South Dakota	Photo ID[6]	Photo ID	Photo ID^^	Affidavit
Tennessee	Provide ID	Provide ID[7]	Provide ID	Affidavit
Texas	Provide ID	Provide ID[8]	Provide ID	Bring ID Later
Utah	Give Name	Provide ID	Give Name	Bring ID Later
Vermont	Give Name	Provide ID	Give Name	Affidavit
Virginia	Provide ID	Provide ID	Provide ID	Affidavit
Washington	Sign Name	Provide ID	Provide ID	Address & Registration
West Virginia	Match Sig.	Provide ID	Match Sig.	Address & Registration
Wisconsin	Give Name	Provide ID	Give Name	Bring ID Later
Wyoming	Give Name	Provide ID	Give Name	Affidavit

* States applies only HAVA's ID requirement, applicable to first-time voters who registered by mail and did not provide applicable ID at the time of registration.

[1] Arizona voters who lack a photo ID may present 2 forms of ID with no photograph.

[2] Florida required a photo ID in 2004, but voters without that credential could sign an affidavit concerning their identity and eligibility and cast a regular ballot. Florida subsequently changed its law to require that voters present photo ID to cast a regular ballot, though voters without photo ID may still cast a provisional ballot by signing an affidavit, which ballot should ordinarily be counted.

[3] Louisiana required a photo ID in 2004. Voters without that credential could sign an affidavit concerning their identity and eligibility and cast a regular ballot.

[4] Pennsylvania requires ID of all first-time voters, whether they registered by mail or in-person.

[5] Voters lacking a photo ID could vote by providing another form of ID in 2004.

[6] Voters lacking a photo ID could vote by providing another form of ID in 2004.

[7] Tennessee voters must provide signature and address. In counties without computerized lists, the signature is compared to the registration card. In counties with computerized lists, the signature is compared to a signature on ID presented with the registration.

[8] Texas voters must present a current registration certificate. Those without a certificate can vote provisionally after completing an affidavit.

Relationship of Voter ID requirements to Turnout

The statistical analysis examined the potential variation in turnout rates based on the type of voter identification required in each state on Election Day 2004 using two sets of data: aggregate turnout data at the county level for each state, as compiled by the Eagleton Institute of Politics, and individual-level survey data included in the November 2004 Current Population Survey conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau.

The statistical analysis examined turnout among U.S. citizens of voting age in both the aggregate and the individual-level data. Determining citizenship status in the individual-level data simply involved restricting the analyses to individuals who identified themselves as citizens in the November 2004 Current Population Survey. (Those who said they were not citizens did not have the opportunity to answer the supplemental voting questions contained in the Current Population Survey.)

Findings of the statistical analysis

The analysis looked at the voter identification requirements in two ways, as a continuous variable and as a series of discrete variables. As a continuous variable the maximum voter identification requirements are ranked according to how demanding they were judged to be, with photo ID as the most demanding requirement. As discrete variables, the statistical analysis assume that stating name is the least demanding ID requirement and compare each other requirement to it.

The analysis treating the requirements as a continuous variable offers some statistical support for the premise that as the level of required proof increases, turnout declines. Averaging across counties in each state, statewide turnout is negatively correlated with maximum voter identification requirements ($r = -.30$, $p < .05$). In considering the array of minimum requirements, with affidavit as the most demanding requirement, however, the correlation between voter identification and turnout is negative, but it is not statistically significant ($r= -.20$, $p = .16$). This suggests that the relationship between turnout rates and minimum requirements may not be linear. Breaking down the turnout rates by type of requirement reveals in greater detail the relationship between voter identification requirements and voter turnout.

Table 2 – Variation in 2004 State Turnout Based on Voter Identification Requirements

Maximum Requirement		Minimum Requirement	
Voter Identification Required in the States	Mean Voter Turnout for States in that Category	Voter Identification Required in the States	Mean Voter Turnout for States in that Category
State Name	**64.2 %**	State Name	**63.0 %**
Sign Name	**61.1 %**	Sign Name	**60.4 %**
Match Signature	**60.9 %**	Match Signature	**61.7 %**
Provide Non-Photo ID	**59.3 %**	Provide Non-Photo ID	**59.0 %**
Provide Photo ID	**58.1 %**	Swear Affidavit	**60.1 %**
Average Turnout (All States)	***60.9 %***		

This table displays the mean turnout using the aggregate county level data for each state in 2004.

The aggregate data show that 60.9 percent of the estimated citizen voting age population voted in 2004. Differences in voter turnout at the state level in 2004 varied based on voter identification requirements. Taking into account the maximum requirements, an average of 64.6 percent of the voting age population turned out in states that required voters to state their names, compared to 58.1 percent in states that required photo identification. A similar trend

emerged when considering minimum requirements. Sixty-three percent of the voting age population turned out in states requiring voters to state their names, compared to 60.1 percent in states that required an affidavit from voters. Given the lack of a clear, consistent linear relationship between turnout and minimum identification requirements, however, we opted to treat the voter identification requirements as a series of dichotomous variables in subsequent analyses.[21]

Voter identification requirements are just one factor that may affect voter turnout. Multivariate models that take into account other predictors of turnout can paint a more complete picture of the relationship between voter identification requirements and turnout. This analysis estimated the effects of voter identification requirements in multivariate models that also took into account the electoral context in 2004 and demographic characteristics of the population in each county. While the model takes account of several important variables, statistical models do not capture all the messiness of the real world. It is a simplification of a complex reality, and its results should be treated with appropriate caution.

The model also took into account such variables as:

- Was the county in a presidential battleground state?
- Was the county was in a state with a competitive race for governor and/or the U.S. Senate?
- Percentage of the voting-age population in each county that was Hispanic or African-American [22]
- Percentage of county residents age 65 and older
- Percentage of county residents below the poverty line

Another contextual factor to consider is voter registration requirements, such as the deadline for registration. As states set the deadline farther away from Election Day, the task of remembering to register to vote becomes more challenging. Thus our model takes into account the number of days between each state's registration deadline and the election.

---

[21] The voter identification requirements are coded as a series of dummy variables, coding each variable as one if the requirement existed in a given state, and zero otherwise. This yielded five dichotomous variables for maximum requirements (state name, sign name, match signature, non-photo identification, or photo identification), and five dichotomous variables for minimum requirements (state name, sign name, match signature, non-photo identification, or providing an affidavit). Omitted is the variable for stating one's name so that it could serve as the reference category in comparison with the other four identification requirements in each of the statistical analyses.

[22] The U.S. Census projections for 2003 provided the data for the percentage of the voting-age population in each county that was Hispanic or African-American and for the percentage of county residents age 65 and older.

The dependent variable in each model was voter turnout at the county level, with turnout calculated as the percentage of the citizen voting-age population that voted in the 2004 election.

The results of this modeling suggest that voter identification requirements such as signature matching, a non-photo ID or a photo ID are associated with lower turnout than in states that required voters to simply state their name, holding constant the electoral context and demographic variables.

Contextual factors, such as whether the county was in a battleground state or whether that state had a competitive race for governor and/or U.S. Senate, were associated with increased voter turnout. The time between the closing date for registration and the election was correlated with a slight negative effect on turnout. As the percentage of Hispanics in the county's population increased, turnout declined. The percentage of senior citizens in the county and household median income were associated with higher turnout. The percentage of African-Americans in the county did not have a significant effect in the model. The percentage of senior citizens in the county and household median income showed a positive correlation with turnout. In this aggregate model, the percentage of African-Americans in the county was not associated with a significant difference in turnout.

The relationship of the minimum voter identification requirements to turnout was not demonstrated. None of the dummy variables for voter identification requirements were statistically significant. Being a battleground state and having a competitive statewide race were significant and positive, as was the percentage of senior citizens in the county and household median income. The percentage of Hispanics in the county's population continued to be associated with reduced turnout, as was the number of days between the closing date for registration and the election. [23]

Analysis of the aggregate data at the county level generates some support for the hypothesis that stricter identification requirements are correlated with lower turnout. For the maximum

[23] This test incorporated a series of interactions between the maximum and minimum voter identification requirements and the percentage of African-Americans and Hispanics living in the counties. In each case the interactions did not improve the fit of the models to the data. See tables A-1 and A-2 in the appendix of Vercellotti's paper in the appendices.

requirements, a signature match, non-photo identification or photo identification were correlated with lower turnout in 2004, compared to requiring that voters simply state their names.

Aggregate data, however, cannot fully capture the individual demographic factors that may figure into the decision to turn out to vote.[24] Voter identification requirements could have a relationship to the turnout of particular groups of voters, in ways that county-level aggregate data on turnout would not capture. To explore the effects of voter identification requirements on turnout more completely, it is important to examine individual-level data as well.

Individual-level Analysis

Individual-level turnout data exists in the November 2004 Current Population Survey conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau. The Census Bureau conducts the CPS monthly to measure unemployment and other workforce data, but the bureau adds a battery of voter participation questions to the November survey in even-numbered years to coincide with either a presidential or midterm Congressional election.

One of the of the CPS is the sheer size of the sample. The survey's Voting and Registration Supplement consisted of interviews, either by telephone or in person, with 96,452 respondents.[25] The large sample size permits analyses of smaller groups, such as Black or Hispanic voters or voters with less than a high school education. The statistical analysis in relying on the CPS is based on reports from *self-described* registered voters. Omitted are those who said they were not registered to vote, as are those who said they cast absentee ballots because the identification requirements for absentee ballots may differ from those required when one votes in person. Eliminated from the sample are respondents who said they were not U.S. citizens; the questionnaire design skipped those individuals past the voter registration and turnout questions in the survey. In addition to the voter identification requirements, the models include other socioeconomic, demographic, and political environment factors that might have

[24] For example, previous research has found that education is a powerful determinant of turnout (Wolfinger and Rosenstone 1980, but see also Nagler 1991).[24] Married people also are more likely to vote than those who are not married (Alvarez and Ansolabehere 2002; Alvarez, Nagler and Wilson 2004; Fisher, Kenny, and Morton 1993).
[25] It is important to note that the Census Bureau allows respondents to answer on behalf of themselves and others in the household during the interview. While proxy reporting of voter turnout raises the possibility of inaccurate reports concerning whether another member of the household voted, follow-up interviews with those for whom a proxy report had been given in the November 1984 CPS showed 99 percent agreement between the proxy report and the information given by the follow-up respondent (U.S. Census Bureau 1990).

influenced turnout in 2004.[26] The dependent variable in these analyses is whether a respondent said he or she voted in the November 2004 election.[27]

In the model, three of the voter identification requirements have a statistically significant correlation with whether survey respondents said they had voted in 2004. That is, compared to states that require voters only to state their names, the requirement to sign one's name, provide a non-photo ID, or photo ID in the maximum requirements or affidavit in the minimum is associated with lower turnout.

Of the other state factors, only the competitiveness of the presidential race showed a significant, correlation with increased turnout. In terms of demographic influences, African-American voters were more likely than white voters or other voters to say they had cast a ballot, while Asian-Americans were less likely than white or other voters to say they had turned out. Hispanic voters were not statistically different from white or other voters in terms of reported turnout. Consistent with previous research, income, and marital status all were positive predictors of voting. Women also were more likely to say they voted than men. Among the age categories, those ages 45 to 64 and 65 and older were more likely than those ages 18 to 24 to say they voted. Respondents who had earned a high school diploma, attended some college, graduated from college or attended graduate school were all more likely to say they voted than those who had not finished high school.

While the probit models provide statistical evidence for the relationship of voter identification requirements and other variables to turnout, probit coefficients do not lend themselves to intuitive interpretation.[28] Table 3 below shows predicted probabilities (calculated from the probit coefficients) of voting for each level of voter identification requirements while holding all other independent variables in the models at their means.[29] .

---

[26] The models are estimated using probit analysis, which calculates the effects of independent variables on the probability that an event occurred – in this case whether a respondent said he or she voted and using robust standard errors to control for correlated error terms for observations from within the same state.

[27] The U.S. Census Bureau reported, based on the November 2004 CPS, that 89 percent of those who identified themselves as registered voters said they voted in 2004 (U.S. Census Bureau 2005). Previous research has shown that, generally speaking, some survey respondents overstate their incidence of voting. Researchers speculate that over-reports may be due to the social desirability that accompanies saying one has done his or her civic duty, or a reluctance to appear outside the mainstream of American political culture (U.S. Census Bureau 1990). It is also possible that voting is an indication of civic engagement that predisposes voters to agree to complete surveys at a higher rate than non-voters (Flanigan and Zingale 2002). Hence the voter turnout rates reported in the CPS tend to be up to 10 percentage points higher than the actual turnout rate for the nation (Flanigan and Zingale 2002). Even with this caveat, however, the CPS serves as a widely accepted source of data on voting behavior.

[28] A probit model is a popular specification of a generalized linear regression model, using the probit link function.

[29] In the case of dichotomous independent variables, holding them at their mean amounted to holding them at the percentage of the sample that was coded 1 for the variable (Long 1997).

Table 3. Predicted probability of voter turnout – all voters		
	Maximum requirement	**Minimum requirement**
State name	91.7%	91.5%
Sign name	89.9%	90.2%
Match signature	Not significant	Not significant
Non-photo ID	89.0%	89.0%
Photo ID	88.8%	----
Affidavit	----	87.%5
Total difference from "state name" to "photo ID" or "affidavit"	**2.9%**	**4.0%**
N	54,973	
Figures represent the predicted probability of registered voters saying they voted as the identification requirement varies stating one's name to providing photo identification or an affidavit, with all other variables held constant. N.S. = nonsignificant coefficient in the probit model. Data source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, Voting and Registration Supplement, November 2004.		

Taking into account that signature matches were not a predictor of turnout, the differences in predicted probability decline from stating one's name to providing a photo identification or affidavit. Voters in states that required photo identification were 2.7 percent less likely to vote than voters in states where individuals had to give their names.[30] In terms of the minimum requirement, voters in states that required an affidavit at minimum were 4 percent less likely to turn out than voters in states where they had to give their names.

The differences were more pronounced for those lower in education. Constraining the model to show predicted probabilities only for those with less than a high school diploma, the probability of voting was 5.1 percent lower in states that required photo identification as the maximum requirement and 7 percent lower in states that required an affidavit as the minimum requirement compared to states where stating one's name was the maximum or minimum requirement.

[30] The voter turnout percentages may seem disproportionately high compared to the turnout rates reported in the aggregate data analysis. It is important to consider that the turnout rates in the aggregate data were a proportion of all citizens of voting-age population, while the turnout rates for the individual-level data are the proportion of only registered voters who said they voted.

Race and ethnicity have generated particular interest in the debate over voter ID requirements.[31] The analysis using the aggregate data shed no light on the association between voter ID requirements and turnout for African-American and Hispanic voters. But in the models using the individual data, some significant relationships emerged for African-American, Hispanic and Asian citizens. For the entire population, the signature, non-photo identification and photo identification requirements all were associated with lower turnout compared to the requirement that voters simply state their names. These correlations translated into reduced probabilities of voting of about 3 to 4 percent for the entire sample, with larger differences for specific subgroups. For example, the predicted probability that Hispanics would vote in states that required non-photo identification was about 10 percentage points lower than in states where Hispanic voters gave their names. The difference was about 6 percent for African-Americans and Asian-Americans, and about 2 percent for white voters.

The model also showed that Hispanic voters were less likely to vote in states that required non-photo identification as opposed to stating one's name. Hispanic voters were 10 percent less likely to vote in non-photo identification states compared to states where voters only had to give their name.

Varying voter identification requirements were associated with lower turnout rates for Asian-American voters as well. Asian-American voters were 8.5 percent less likely to vote in states that required non-photo identification compared to states that require voters to state their names under the maximum requirements, and they were 6.1 percent less likely to vote where non-photo identification was the minimum requirement.

Conclusions of the Statistical Analysis

The statistical analysis found that, as voter identification requirements vary, voter turnout varies as well. This finding emerged from both the aggregate data and the individual-level data, although not always for both the maximum and minimum sets of requirements. The overall relationship between ID requirements and turnout for all registered voters was fairly small, but still statistically significant.

[31] Incorporating discrete variables for Hispanics, African-Americans, and Asian-Americans into one model carries the implicit assumption that the remaining variables, including education and income, will influence each of these groups in a similar manner in terms of deciding whether to vote. These assumptions are not always born out by the data (see Leighley and Vedlitz, 1999.) To isolate the effects of voter identification and other variables on voter turnout within specific racial and ethnic groups, the sample is divided into sub-samples and the model re-run to calculate the data discussed and shown in Tables 5, 6, and 7 in Appendix C.

In the aggregate data, the match signature requirement, the provide a non-photo ID requirement, and the photo ID requirement were all correlated with lower turnout compared to requiring that voters state their names.

The signature, non-photo ID, and photo ID requirements were all correlated with lower turnout compared to the requirement that voters simply state their names. That the non-photo identification requirement was the most consistent in terms of statistical significance across the groups is intriguing given the intense debates surrounding photo identification requirements.

Significant questions about the relationship between voter identification requirements and turnout remain unanswered. The data examined in the statistical analysis could not capture the dynamics of how identification requirements might lower turnout, nor could they rule out that other attributes of a state's electoral system might explain the statistically significant correlations that the study found. If ID requirements dampen turnout, is it because individuals are aware of the requirements and stay away from the polls because they cannot or do not want to meet the requirements? Or, do the requirements result in some voters being turned away when they cannot meet the requirements on Election Day , or forced to cast a provisional ballot that is not ultimately counted? The CPS data do not include measures that can answer this question. Knowing more about the "on the ground" experiences of voters concerning identification requirements could guide policy-makers at the state and local level in determining whether and at what point in the electoral cycle a concerted public information campaign might be most effective in helping voters to meet identification requirements. Such knowledge also could help in designing training for election judges to handle questions about, and potential disputes over, voter identification requirements.

Litigation Over Voter ID Requirements

A handful of cases have challenged identification requirements in court in recent years. In general, requirements that voters provide some identifying documentation have been upheld, where photo ID is *not* the only acceptable form. Whether laws requiring photo ID will be upheld is more doubtful. To date, only two cases have considered laws requiring voters to show photo ID (*Common Cause v. Billups* and *Indiana Democratic Party v. Rokita*).. Cases challenging the mandatory disclosure of voters' Social Security numbers on privacy grounds have yielded mixed results.

Non-photo identification. For the most part, courts have looked favorably on requirements that voters present some form of identifying documents if the photo identification is not the

only form accepted. In *Colorado Common Cause v. Davidson,* No. 04CV7709, 2004 WL 2360485, at *1 (Colo. Dist. Ct. Oct. 18, 2004), plaintiffs challenged a law requiring all in-person voters to show identification (not just first-time registrants). The court upheld this requirement against a constitutional challenge. Similarly, in *League of Women Voters v. Blackwell,* 340 F. Supp. 2d 823 (N.D. Ohio 2004), the court rejected a challenge to an Ohio directive requiring first-time voters who registered by mail to provide one of the HAVA-permitted forms of identification, in order to have their provisional ballots counted. Specifically, the directive provided that their provisional ballots would be counted if the voter (a) orally recited his driver's license number or the last four digits of his social security number or (b) returned to the polling place before it closed with some acceptable identification (including reciting those identification numbers). *Id.* This was found to be consistent with HAVA.

Photo ID. Since the 2004 election, two states have adopted laws requiring photo identification at the polls in order to have one's vote counted, without an affidavit exception: Georgia and Indiana.[32] Both these requirements were enacted in 2005 and both have been challenged in court. The Georgia law required voters attempting to cast a ballot in person present a valid form of photographic identification. O.C.G.A. § 21-2-417. On October 18, 2005, the District Court granted the plaintiffs' motion for a preliminary injunction, enjoining the application of the new identification requirements on constitutional grounds. In granting the injunction, the court held that plaintiffs' claims under both the Fourteenth Amendment (equal protection) and Twenty-Fourth Amendment (poll tax) had a substantial likelihood of succeeding on the merits at trial (*Common Cause v. Billups*, Prelim. Inj. 96, 104). In January 2006, Georgia enacted a modified version of its photo ID law, which the court has not yet ruled on. In the other state that has enacted a photo ID requirement (Indiana), legal challenges have also been filed. (*Indiana Democratic Party v. Rokita* and *Crawford v. Marion County Election Board*). On April 14, 2006, the district court granted defendants' motion for summary judgment, concluding that plaintiffs had failed to produce evidence showing that the state's ID law would have an adverse impact on voters. Another case of significance, for purposes of photo ID requirements, is *American Civil Liberties Union of Minnesota v. Kiffmeyer,* No. 04-CV-4653, 2004 WL

[32] Indiana's law does allow voters without ID to cast provisional ballots, and then to appear before the county board of elections to execute an affidavit saying that they are indigent and unable to obtain the requisite ID without payment of a fee. But in contrast to other states, voters cannot cast a ballot that will be counted by submitting an affidavit at the polls, affirming that they are the registered voter and are otherwise eligible to vote.

2428690, at *1 (D. Minn. Oct. 28, 2004). In that case, the court enjoined a Minnesota law that allowed the use of tribal photo ID cards, only for an Indian who lived on the reservation. 2004 WL 2428690, at *1. The Court found no rational basis for distinguishing based on whether or not the cardholder lives on the reservation. *Id.* at *1, 3. These decisions indicate that courts are likely to carefully scrutinize the evidence regarding the impact of photo ID requirements.

Privacy. In *Greidinger v. Davis*, 988 F.2d 1344 (4th Cir. 1993), the court struck down on due process grounds a Virginia law requiring disclosure of voters' social security numbers for voter registration. The social security numbers recorded in voter registration lists had been disclosed to the public and political parties that had requested the lists. The court found that the requirement to give the social security number effectively conditioned rights on the consent to an invasion of privacy. It concluded that this public disclosure of the social security numbers was not necessary to achieve the government's interest in preventing fraud. On the other hand, in *McKay v. Thompson*, 226 F.3d 752 (6th Cir. 2000), the court rejected privacy challenges based on both the Constitution and federal statutes, to a Tennessee law requiring social security numbers for voter registration since 1972. 226 F.3d at 755. Second, the NVRA only permits requiring the minimum amount of information necessary to prevent duplicate voter registration and to determine eligibility. The distinction appears to be between the use of Social Security numbers for internal purposes only, which was deemed permissible, and the disclosure of those numbers to the public which was not.

These decisions suggest that the courts will carefully scrutinize the evidence, where states require that voters produce a photo ID in order to cast a regular ballot. The courts have used a balancing test to weigh the legitimate interest in preventing election fraud against the citizen's right to privacy (protecting social security numbers from public disclosure, for example) and the reasonableness of requirements for identity documents. To provide both the clarity and certainty in administration of elections needed to forestall destabilizing challenges to outcomes, these early decisions suggest that best practice may be to limit requirements for voter identification to the minimum needed to prevent duplicate registration and ensure eligibility.

Developments since 2004

Since the passage of HAVA, with its limited requirements for voter identification, and following the 2004 election, debate over voter ID has taken place in state legislatures across the country. That debate has not been characterized by solid information on the consequences of tightening requirements for voters to identify themselves before being permitted to cast a regular, rather than a provisional, ballot.

Better information might improve the quality of the debate. Answers to the following key questions are not available in a form that might satisfy those on both sides of the argument.

- What is the overall incidence of vote fraud?
- How does fraud take place in the various stage of the process: registration, voting at the polls, absentee voting, or ballot counting?
- What contribution can tighter requirements for voter ID make to reducing vote fraud?
- What would be the other consequences of increasingly demanding requirements for voters to identify themselves? This is the question addressed, within the limits of the available data, in the analysis in this report.

Answering these questions would provide the information needed for more informed judgment in the states as they consider the tradeoffs among the competing goals of ballot integrity, ballot access, and administrative efficiency. The Carter-Baker Commission recognized the tradeoffs when it tied recommendation for national ID to an affirmative effort by government to identify unregistered voters and make it easy for them to register.

State Voter Databases and Voter ID

With the implementation of the HAVA Computerized Statewide Voter Registration List, an application for voter registration for an election for Federal office may not be accepted or processed unless the application includes a driver's license number or last four digits of the Social Security number on the voter registration form. This information can be used to verify the identity of the registrant through interfacing with lists maintained by the Motor Vehicle office and Social Security office. If registrants do not have either a driver's license or Social Security number, the State will assign a unique identifier number to that person.

Some states are wrestling now with these unresolved issues. In New Jersey, for example, pending legislation would require that voters must be able to confirm their registration through a secure access to the Statewide Voter Registration List. It also requires voters to present ID at

the polls in order to cast a regular ballot if the numbers recorded on the registration have not been verified (or if no verifiable number appears on the registration). It recognizes the HAVA requirement that if the number provided by the voter has not been verified and if the voter does not present ID at the polls, that voter may cast a provisional ballot. The bill does not specify they have to provide ID within 48 hours in order for their vote to count, as is the case with first-time mail-in registrants.

As some states gain experience in this area, the EAC would perform a useful service by making timely recommendations of best practices for all states to consider.

Conclusions

The analysis of voter ID requirements is complex. It takes into account important values associated with an electoral process, such as ballot access and integrity. The continuing effort to understand how voter ID requirements may affect turnout and the integrity of the ballot could benefit from additional factual information, including statistical analyses. Our research includes a statistical study of this kind. It indicated that the level of voter turnout in a state is correlated with the stringency of the voter ID requirement imposed by that state. Additional empirical research of this nature, with additional data collected by or for the EAC, would further illuminate the relationship between stricter voter ID rules and turnout, perhaps explaining if awareness of a strict ID requirement tends to discourage would-be voters from going to the polls. Or, additional research may shed light on whether, if voters did go to the polls, stricter Voter ID requirements will divert more voters into the line for provisional ballots. The consequence of increased reliance on provisional ballots can be longer lines at the polls and confusion, without necessarily a clear demonstration that the security of the ballot is correspondingly increased. [33]

The debate over voter ID in the states would be improved by additional research sponsored by the EAC. That might include longitudinal studies of jurisdictions that have changed voter ID requirements, as well as precinct-level analyses that would allow more finely tuned assessment of the correlation between stricter identification requirements and turnouts. Further research could also identify methods to eliminate the need for voters to bring specific identity documents

[33] In this connection, the Brennan Center's response to the Carter-Baker Commission report observes that, "while it might be true that in a close election "a small amount of fraud could make the margin of difference," it is equally true that the rejection of a much larger number of eligible voters could make a much bigger difference in the outcome." *Response to the Report of the 2005 Commission on Federal Election Reform*, The Brennan Center for Justice at NYU School of Law and Spencer Overton, On Behalf Of The National Network on State Election Reform, September 19, 2005

with them to the polls, while assuring that each voter who casts a ballot is eligible and votes only once.

Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV
06/28/2006 11:57 AM

To Darrell D. Lee/CONTRACTOR/EAC/GOV
cc
bcc
Subject Fw: PV Final Draft for Review by Advisory and Standards Boards

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue , NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

----- Forwarded by Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV on 06/28/2006 11:55 AM -----

"Tom O'neill"
[redacted]
05/12/2006 04:51 PM

To klynndyson@eac.gov
cc [redacted], "Tim Vercellotti" [redacted]
Subject PV Final Draft for Review by Advisory and Standards Boards

Karen,

Attached is the Final Draft of our report on Provisional Voting for review by the Advisory Board and the Standards Board. I understand from our conversation earlier today that it will be reviewed by the Commissioners at their meeting next week, and, if approved by them, distributed to the boards in advance of their meetings on May 23 and 24. This report will form the basis of our PowerPoint briefing for the boards at those meetings. I will not have hard copies of those PowerPoint presentations for distribution to the boards until the day of the meeting.

We intend to have the Final Draft Voter ID Report to you in time for review by the Commissioners at their second meeting next week.

Thanks for your guidance.

Tom O'Neill

PVFINALDRAFT0512.doc

Report to the

U. S. Election Assistance Commission

On

Best Practices to Improve Provisional Voting

Pursuant to the

HELP AMERICA VOTE ACT OF 2002

Public Law 107-252

May 12, 2006

Submitted by

The Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

The Moritz College of Law, The Ohio State University

FINAL DRAFT
For Review by the Standards Board and Board of Advisors

Report to the U. S. Election Assistance Commission

Best Practices to Improve Provisional Voting

CONTENTS

Peer Review Group

R. Michael Alvarez
Professor of Political Science
California Institute of Technology

John C. Harrison
Massee Professor of Law
University of Virginia School of Law

Martha E. Kropf
Assistant Professor Political Science
University of Missouri-Kansas City

Daniel H. Lowenstein
Professor of Law, School of Law
University of California at Los Angeles

Timothy G. O'Rourke
Dean, Fulton School of Liberal Arts
Salisbury University

Bradley Smith
Professor of Law
Capital University Law School

Tim Storey
Program Principal
National Conference of State Legislatures

Peter G. Verniero
former Attorney General, State of New Jersey
Counsel, Sills, Cummis, Epstein and Gross, PC

The Peer Review Group improved the quality of our work by critiquing drafts of our analysis, conclusions and recommendations. While the Group as a whole and the comments of its members individually contributed generously to the research effort, any errors of fact or weaknesses in inference are the responsibility of the Eagleton-Moritz research team. The members of the Peer Review Group do not necessarily share the views reflected in the policy recommendations of the report.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background and Methodology

This report to the United States Election Assistance Commission (EAC) presents recommendations for best practices to improve the process of provisional voting. It is based on research conducted by the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, and the Moritz College of Law at Ohio State University under contract to the EAC, dated May 24, 2005.

The Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA, (Public Law 107-252) authorizes the EAC (SEC. 241, 42 USC 15381) to conduct periodic studies of election administration issues. The purpose of these studies is to promote methods for voting and administering elections, including provisional voting, that are convenient, accessible and easy to use; that yield accurate, secure and expeditious voting systems; that afford each registered and eligible voter an equal opportunity to vote and to have that vote counted; and that are efficient. Section 302(a) of HAVA required states to establish provisional balloting procedures by January 2004.[1] The process HAVA outlined left considerable room for variation among the states, arguably including such critical questions as who qualifies as a registered voter eligible to cast a provisional ballot that will be counted and in what jurisdiction (precinct or larger unit) the ballot must be cast in order to be counted.[2]

The general requirement for provisional voting is that, if a registered voter appears at a polling place to vote in an election for Federal office, but either the potential voter's name does not appear on the official list of eligible voters for the polling place, or an election official asserts that the individual is not eligible to vote, that potential voter must be permitted to cast a provisional ballot. In some states, those who should receive a provisional ballot include, in the words of the EAC's Election Day Survey, "first-time voters who registered by mail without identification and cannot provide identification, as required under HAVA. . ." [3] HAVA also provides that those who vote pursuant to a court order keeping the polls open after the established closing hour shall vote by provisional ballot. Election administrators are required by HAVA to notify individuals of their opportunity to cast a provisional ballot.

---

[1] The Election Center's National Task Force Report on Election Reform in July 2001 had described provisional ballots as providing "voters whose registration status cannot be determined at the polls or verified at the election office the opportunity to vote. The validity of these ballots is determined later, thus ensuring that no eligible voter is turned away and those truly ineligible will not have their ballots counted." It recommended "in the absence of election day registration or other solutions to address registration questions, provisional ballots must be adopted by all jurisdictions. " See www.electioncenter.org .

[2] The 2004 election saw at least a dozen suits filed on the issue of whether votes cast in the wrong precinct but the correct county should be counted. One federal circuit court decided the issue in *Sandusky County Democratic Party v. Blackwell, 387 F.3d565* (6th Cir. 2004), which held that votes cast outside the correct precinct did not have to be counted. The court relied on the presumption that Congress must be clear in order to alter the state-federal balance; thus Congress, the court concluded would have been clearer had it intended to eliminate state control over polling location (387 F.3d at 578). An alternative argument, that HAVA's definition of "jurisdiction" incorporates the broader definition in the National Voting Rights Act, however, has not been settled by a higher court. But for now states do seem to have discretion in how they define "jurisdiction" for the purpose of counting a provisional ballot.

[3] The definition of who was entitled to a provisional ballot could differ significantly among the states. In California, for example, the Secretary of State directed counties to provide voters with the option of voting on a provisional paper ballot if they felt uncomfortable casting votes on the paperless e-voting machines. "I don't want a voter to not vote on Election Day because the only option before them is a touch-screen voting machine. I want that voter to have the confidence that he or she can vote on paper and have the confidence that their vote was cast as marked," Secretary Shelley said. See http://wired.com/news/evote/0,2645,63298,00.html . (Our analysis revealed no differences in the use of provisional ballots in the counties with these paperless e-voting machines.) In Ohio, long lines at some polling places resulted in legal action directing that voters waiting in line be given provisional ballots to enable them to vote before the polls closed. (Columbus Dispatch, November 3, 2004 .)

Our research began in late May 2005. It focused on six key questions raised by the EAC.

1. How did the states prepare for the onset of the HAVA provisional ballot requirement?
2. How did this vary between states that had previously had some form of provisional ballot and those that did not?
3. How did litigation affect implementation?
4. How effective was provisional voting in enfranchising qualified voters?
5. Did state and local processes provide for consistent counting of provisional ballots?
6. Did local election officials have a clear understanding of how to implement provisional voting?

To answer those questions, we:

1. Surveyed 400 local (mostly county) election officials to learn their views about the administration of provisional voting and to gain insights into their experience in the 2004 election.
2. Reviewed the EAC's Election Day Survey, news and other published reports in all 50 states to understand the local background of provisional voting and develop leads for detailed analysis.[4]
3. Analyzed statistically provisional voting data from the 2004 election to determine associations between the use of provisional voting and such variables as states' experience with provisional voting, use of statewide registration databases, counting out-of-precinct ballots, and use of different approached to voter identification.
4. Collected and reviewed the provisional voting statutes and regulations in all 50 states.
5. Analyzed litigation affecting provisional voting or growing out of disputes over provisional voting in all states.

Our research is intended to provide EAC with a strategy to engage the states in a continuing effort to strengthen the provisional voting process and increase the consistency with which provisional voting is administered, particularly within a state. As EAC and the states move forward to assess and adopt the recommendations made here, provisional voting merits continuing observation and research. The situation is fluid. As states, particularly those states that did not offer a provisional ballot before 2004, gain greater experience with the process and as statewide voter databases are adopted, the provisional voting process will demand further, research-based refinement.

KEY FINDINGS

Variation among the states

In the 2004 election, nationwide about 1.9 million votes, or 1.6% of turnout, were cast as provisional ballots. More than 1.2 million, or just over 63%, were counted. Provisional ballots accounted for a little more than 1% of the final vote tally. These totals obscure the wide variation in provisional voting among the states.[5]

---

[4] Attachment 1 provides detailed information on how this study classifies the states according to the characteristics of their provisional voting procedures. It also describes how the data used in the statistical analysis may differ from the data in the Election Day Survey, which became available as our research was concluding.

[5] HAVA allows the states considerable latitude in how to implement provisional voting, including deciding who beyond the required categories of voters should receive provisional ballots and how to determine which provisional ballots should be counted.

- Six states accounted for two-thirds of all the provisional ballots cast.[6]
- The percentage of provisional ballots in the total vote varied by a factor of 1,000 -- from a high of 7% in Alaska to Vermont's 0.006%.
- The portion of provisional ballots cast that were counted ranged from 96% in Alaska to 6% in Delaware.
- States with voter registration databases counted, on average, 20% of the provisional ballots cast.
- States without databases counted ballots at more than twice that rate: 44%.[7]
- States that provided more time to evaluate provisional ballots counted a greater proportion of those ballots. Those that provided less than one week counted an average of 35.4% of their ballots, while states that permitted more than 2 weeks, counted 60.8%.

An important source of variation among states was a state's previous experience with provisional voting. The share of provisional ballots in the total vote was six times greater in states that had used provisional ballots before than in states where the provisional ballot was new. In the 25 states that had some experience with provisional voting before HAVA, a higher portion of the total vote was cast as provisional ballots and a greater percentage of the provisional ballots cast were counted than in the 18 new to provisional balloting.[8]

Variation within states

Within states, too, there was little consistency among different jurisdictions. Of the 20 states for which we have county-level provisional ballot data, the rate of counting provisional ballots varied by as much as 90% to 100% among counties in the same state. This suggests that additional factors (including the training of election judges or poll workers) beyond statewide factors, such as experience or the existence of voter registration databases, also influence the use of provisional ballots.

- In Ohio some counties counted provisional ballots not cast in the assigned precinct even though the state's policy was to count only those ballots cast in the correct precinct.
- Some counties in Washington tracked down voters who would otherwise have had their provisional ballots rejected because they had failed to complete part of their registration form, gave them the chance to correct those omissions, and then counted the provisional ballot.

Resources available to administer provisional voting varied considerably among and within states. Differences in demographics and resources result in different experiences with provisional voting. For example, the Election Day Survey found that staffing problems appeared to be particularly acute for jurisdictions in the lowest income and education categories. Small, rural jurisdictions and large, urban jurisdictions tended to report higher rates of an inadequate number of poll workers within polling places or precincts.

- Jurisdictions with lower education and income tend to report more inactive voter registrations, lower turnout, and more provisional ballots cast.

---

[6] California, New York, Ohio, Arizona, Washington, and North Carolina. The appearance of Arizona, Washington and North Carolina on this list shows that the number of provisional ballots cast depends on factors other than the size of the population.

[7] As the Carter-Baker Commission report put it, "provisional ballots were needed half as often in states with unified databases as in states without." Report on the Commission on Federal Election Reform, "Building Confidence in U. S. Elections," September 2005, p. 16.

[8] See the appendix for our classification of "old" and "new" states and explanation of why the total is less than 50.

- Jurisdictions with higher levels of income and education reported higher average numbers of poll workers per polling place or precinct and reported lower rates of staffing problems per precinct.

In precincts located in districts where many voters live in poverty and have low levels of income and education, the voting process, in general, may be managed poorly. Provisional ballots cannot be expected to work much better. In these areas, the focus should be on broader measures to improve the overall functionality of struggling voting districts, although improving the management of provisional balloting may help at the margin.

The lessons of litigation

Successful legal challenges highlight areas where provisional voting procedures were wanting. A flurry of litigation occurred around the country in October 2004 concerning the so-called "wrong precinct issue" – whether provisional ballots cast by voters in a precinct other than their designated one would be counted for statewide races. Most courts, including the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit (the only federal appeals court to rule on the issue), rejected the contention that HAVA requires the counting of these wrong-precinct provisional ballots. This litigation was significant nonetheless.

- First, the Sixth Circuit decision established the precedent that voters have the right to sue in federal court to remedy violations of HAVA.
- Second –and significantly– the litigation clarified the right of voters to receive provisional ballots, even though the election officials were certain they would not be counted. The decision also defined an ancillary right –the right to be directed to the correct precinct. There voters could cast a regular ballot that would be counted. If they insisted on casting a provisional ballot in the wrong precinct, they would be on notice that it would be a symbolic gesture only.
- Third, these lawsuits prompted election officials to take better care in instructing precinct officials on how to notify voters about the need to go to the correct precinct in order to cast a countable ballot.

States move to improve their processes

Shortly after the 2004 election, several states came to the conclusion that the administration of their provisional voting procedures needed to be improved, and they amended their statutes. The new legislation highlights areas of particular concern to states about their provisional voting process.

- Florida, Indiana, Virginia, and Washington have clarified or extended the timeline to evaluate the ballots.
- Colorado, New Mexico, North Carolina, and Washington have passed legislation focused on improving the efficacy and consistency of the voting and counting process.
- Colorado, Arkansas, and North Dakota took up the issue of counting provisional ballots cast in the wrong precinct.

The wide variation in the implementation of provisional voting among and within states suggests that EAC can help states strengthen their processes. Research-based recommendations for best, or at least better, practices that draw on the experience gained in the 2004 election can be useful in states' efforts to achieve greater consistency in the administration of provisional voting. The important effect of experience on the administration of the provisional ballot process indicates that the states have much they can learn from each other.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR BEST PRACTICES

State efforts to improve the provisional voting process have been underway since the 2004 election. By recommending best practices, the EAC will offer informed advice while respecting diversity among the states.

Take a quality-improvement approach

Defining what constitutes a successful provisional voting system is difficult. Defining quality requires a broad perspective about how well the system works, how open it is to error recognition and correction, and how well provisional voting processes are connected to the registration and voter identification regimes. A first step is for states to recognize that improving quality begins with seeing the provisional voting process as a system and taking a systems approach to regular evaluation through standardized metrics with explicit goals for performance. EAC can facilitate action by the states by recommending as a best practice that:

- Each state collect data systematically on the provisional voting process to permit evaluation of its voting system and assess changes from one election to the next. The data collected should include: provisional votes cast and counted by county; reasons why provisional ballots were not counted, measures of variance among jurisdictions, and time required to evaluate ballots by jurisdiction

Emphasize the importance of clarity

Above all else, the EAC should emphasize the importance of clarity in the rules by which each state governs provisional voting. As state legislators and election officials prepare for the 2006 election, answers to the questions listed in the recommendation section of this report could be helpful. Among those questions are:

- Does the provisional voting system distribute, collect, record, and tally provisional ballots with sufficient accuracy to be seen as procedurally legitimate by both supporters and opponents of the winning candidate?
- Do the procedural requirements of the system permit cost-efficient operation?
- How great is the variation in the use of provisional voting in counties or equivalent levels of voting jurisdiction within the state? Is the variation great enough to cause concern that the system may not be administered uniformly across the state?

Court decisions suggest areas for action

The court decisions following the 2004 election also suggest procedures for states to incorporate into their procedures for provisional voting. EAC should recommend to the states that they:

- Promulgate clear standards for evaluating provisional ballots, and provide training for the officials who will apply those standards.
- Provide effective materials to be used by local jurisdictions in training poll workers on such procedures as how to locate polling places for potential voters who show up at the wrong place.
- Make clear that the only permissible requirement to obtain a provisional ballot is an affirmation that the voter is registered in the jurisdiction and eligible to vote in an election for federal office. Poll workers need appropriate training to understand their duty to give such voters a provisional ballot.

Assess each stage of the provisional voting process

Beyond the procedures suggested by court decisions, states should assess each stage of the provisional voting process. They can begin by assessing the utility and clarity of the information for voters on their websites and by considering what information might be added to sample ballots mailed to voters before elections. The better voters understand their rights and obligations, the easier the system will be to manage, and the more legitimate the appearance of the process.

Avoiding error at the polling place will allow more voters to cast a regular ballot and all others who request it to cast a provisional ballot. Our recommendations for best practices to avoid error at the polling place include:

- The layout and staffing of the multi-precinct polling place is important. States should ensure that training materials distributed to every jurisdiction make poll workers familiar with the options available to voters.
- The provisional ballot should be of a design or color sufficiently different from a regular ballot to avoid confusion over counting and include take-away information for the voter on the steps in the ballot evaluation process.
- Because provisional ballots offer a fail-safe, supplies of the ballots at each polling place should be sufficient for all the potential voters likely to need them. Best practice would be for states should provide guidelines (as do Connecticut and Delaware) to estimate the supply of provisional ballots needed at each polling place.

The clarity of criteria for evaluating voter eligibility is critical to a sound process for deciding which of the cast provisional ballots should be counted.

- .State statutes or regulations should define a reasonable period for voters who lack the HAVA-specified ID or other information bearing on their eligibility to provide it in order to facilitate the state's ability to verify that the person casting the provisional ballot is the same one who registered. At least 11 states allow voters to provide ID or other information one to 13 days after voting. Kansas allows voters to proffer their ID by electronic means or by mail, as well as in person.
- More provisional voters have their ballots counted in those states that count ballots cast outside the correct precinct. While HAVA arguably leaves this decision up to the states, pointing out the effect of the narrower definition on the portion of ballots counted could be useful to the states in deciding this question. States should be aware, however, of the additional burden placed on the ballot-evaluation process when out-of-precinct ballots are considered. And tradeoffs are involved if out-of-precinct voters are unable to vote for the local offices that might appear on the ballot in their district of residence.
- If a state does require voters to appear at their assigned precinct, where the same polling site serves more than one precinct, a voter's provisional ballot should count so long as the voter cast that ballot at the correct polling site even if at the wrong precinct within that location. While the best practice might be for poll workers to direct the voter to correct precinct poll workers' advice is not always correct, and the voter should be protect against ministerial error.
- Officials should follow a written procedure, and perhaps a checklist, to identify the reason why a provisional ballot is rejected. Colorado's election rules offer particularly clear guidance to the official evaluating a provisional ballot.

In verifying provisional ballots, the time by which election officials must make their eligibility determinations is particularly important in presidential elections because of the need to certify electors to the Electoral College. Our research did not identify an optimum division of the five weeks available.

- The best practice here is for states to consider the issue and make a careful decision about how to complete all steps in the evaluation of ballots and challenges to those determinations within the five weeks available.

After the election, timely information to voters about the disposition of their provisional ballot can enable voters to determine if they are registered for future elections and, if not, what they need to do to become registered.

- Best practice for the states is to establish mechanisms to ensure that voters casting provisional ballots are informed whether they are now registered for future elections and, if not, what they need to do to become registered.

Final observation

The detailed examination of each stage in the provisional voting process can lay the foundation each state needs to improve its system. Efforts to improve provisional voting may be most effective as part of a broader effort by state and local election officials to strengthen their systems. Collecting and analyzing data about those systems will enable states to identify which aspects of the registration and electoral system are most important in shunting voters into the provisional ballot process. Responsible officials can then look to their registration system, identification requirements or poll worker training as ways to reduce the need for voters to cast their ballots provisionally.

Provisional Voting in 2004

In the 2004 election, nationwide about 1.9 million votes, or 1.6% of turnout, were cast as provisional ballots. More than 1.2 million or just over 63% were counted. Provisional ballots accounted for a little more than 1% of the final vote tally.

These totals obscure the wide variation in provisional voting among the states.[9] Six states accounted for two-thirds of all the provisional ballots cast.[10] State by state, the percentage of provisional ballots in the total vote varied by a factor of 1,000 -- from a high of 7% in Alaska to Vermont's 0.006%. The portion of provisional ballots cast that were actually counted also displayed wide variation, ranging from 96% in Alaska to 6% in Delaware. States with voter registration databases counted, on average, 20% of the provisional ballots cast. Those without databases counted provisional ballots at more than twice that rate, 44%.

An important source of variation was a state's previous experience with provisional voting. The share of provisional ballots in the total vote was six times greater in states that had used provisional ballots before than in states where the provisional ballot was new. In the 25 states that had some experience with provisional voting before HAVA, a higher portion of the total vote was cast as provisional ballots and a greater percentage of the provisional ballots cast were counted than in the 18 new to provisional balloting.[11]

- The percentage of the total vote cast as provisional ballots averaged more than 2% in the 25 experienced states. This was 4 times the rate in states new to provisional voting, which averaged 0.47%. [12]
- The experienced states counted an average of 58% of the provisional ballots cast, nearly double the proportion in the new states, which counted just 33% of cast provisional ballots.
- The combined effect of these two differences was significant. In experienced states 1.53% of the total vote came from counted provisional ballots. In new states, provisional ballots accounted for only 0.23% of the total vote.

Those voting with provisional ballots in experienced states had their ballots counted more frequently than those in the new states. This experience effect is evidence that there is room for improvement in provisional balloting procedures, especially in those states new to the process.[13] That conclusion gains support from the perspectives of the local election officials revealed in the survey conducted as a part of this research. Local (mostly county level) election officials from "experienced" states were more likely to:

---

[9] HAVA allows the states considerable latitude in how to implement provisional voting, including deciding who beyond the required categories of voters should receive provisional ballots and how to determine which provisional ballots should be counted.

[10] California, New York, Ohio, Arizona, Washington, and North Carolina. The appearance of Arizona, Washington and North Carolina on this list shows that the number of provisional ballots cast depends on factors other than the size of the population.

[11] See the appendix for our classification of "old" and "new" states and explanation of why the total is less than 50.

[12] To compensate for the wide differences in vote turnout among the 50 states the average figures here are calculated as the mean of the percent cast or counted rather than from the raw numbers of ballots cast or counted.

[13] Managing the provisional voting process can strain the capacity election administrators. For example, Detroit, counted 123 of the 1,350 provisional ballots cast there in 2004. A recent study concluded that Detroit's " 6-day time limit to process provisional ballots was very challenging and unrealistic. To overcome this challenge, *the entire department's employees were mobilized to process provisional ballots.*" (emphasis added.) GAO Report-05-997, "Views of Selected Local Officials on Managing Voter Registration and Ensuring Citizens Can Vote," September 2005.

- Be prepared to direct voters to their correct precincts with maps;
- Regard provisional voting as easy to implement;
- Report that provisional voting sped up and improved polling place operations
- Conclude that the provisional voting process helped officials maintain accurate registration databases.

Officials from "new" states, on the other hand, were more likely to agree with the statement that provisional voting created unnecessary problems for election officials and poll workers.

If experience with provisional voting does turn out to be a key variable in performance, that is good news. As states gain experience with provisional ballots their management of the process could become more consistent and more effective over subsequent elections. Further information from the EAC on best practices and the need for more consistent management of the election process could sharpen the lessons learned by experience. The EAC can facilitate the exchange of experience among the states and can offer all states information on more effective administration of provisional voting.

Concluding optimistically that experience will make all the difference, however, may be unwarranted. Only if the performance of the "new" states was the result of administrative problems stemming from inexperience will improvement be automatic as election officials move along the learning curve. Two other possibilities exist. Our current understanding of how provisional voting worked in 2004 is not sufficient to determine unambiguously which view is correct.

1. "New" states may have a political culture different from "old" states. That is, underlying features of the "new" states political system may be the reason they had not adopted some form of provisional voting before HAVA. The "new" states may strike a different balance among the competing objectives of ballot access, ballot security and practical administration. They may ascribe more responsibility to the individual voter to take such actions as registering early, finding out where the right precinct is, or re-registering after changing address. They may value keeping control at the local level, rather than ceding authority to state or federal directives. The training they offer poll workers about provisional ballots may not be as frequent or effective as in other states. If the inconsistent performance in the "new" states arises out of this kind of political culture, improving effectiveness in the use of the provisional ballots -- as measured by intrastate consistency in administration--- will be harder and take longer to achieve.[14]
2. "Old" states may devote fewer resources to updating their registration files or databases because they consider provisional ballots as a reasonable fail safe way for voters with registration problems a way to cast a ballot. The adoption of statewide voter registration databases in compliance with HAVA therefore may reduce the variation in the use of provisional ballots among the states.

Other influences decreasing consistency among the states include:

[14] Despite differing political cultures among states and the latitude HAVA provides states, the statute does, indeed impose some degree of uniformity on issues that Congress thought essential. For example, before HAVA, took effect, "no state gave the voter the right to find out the status of their ballot after the election. " Now all offer that opportunity. See Bali and Silver, "The Impact of Politics, Race and Fiscal Strains on State Electoral Reforms after Election 2000," manuscript, Department of Political Science, Michigan State University. Resisting HAVA's mandates through foot-dragging lacks any legitimate foundation in law or policy.

- The more rigorous the verification requirements, the smaller the percentage of provisional ballots that were counted. Some states verified provisional ballots by comparing the voter's signature to a sample, some matched such identifying data as address, birth date, or social security number, others required voters who lacked ID at the polling place to return later with the ID to evaluate the provisional ballot, ans some required provisional voters to execute an affidavit. [15]
  - In the 4 states that simply matched signatures, nearly 3.5% of the total turnout consisted of provisional ballots, and just under three-fourths of those ballots (73%) were counted.
  - In the 14 states that required voters to provide such additional information as address or date of birth just over 1.5% of the total turnout consisted of provisional ballots, and 55% of those ballots were counted.
  - In the 14 states that required an affidavit (attesting, for example, that the voter was legally registered and eligible to vote in the jurisdiction) just over one-half of a percent (0.6%) of turnout came from provisional ballots, and less than one-third of those (30%) were counted. (But note that HAVA requires all voters to certify that they are eligible and registered in order to cast a provisional ballot, which is functionally an affidavit. The 14 states described here used an explicit affidavit form.)
  - In the 10 states that required voters to return later with identifying documents just under 1.5% of the total turnout came from provisional ballots, and more than half (52%) of these were counted. Voters apparently found this requirement less onerous than the affidavit, even though it required a separate trip to a government office

- Voter registration databases provided information that reduced the number of provisional ballots counted.[16] In states using provisional voting for the first time, states with registered-voter databases counted only 20% of the ballots that were cast. States without such databases counted more than double that rate (44%). As HAVA's requirement for adoption of statewide databases spreads across the country, this variation among states is likely to narrow. Real-time access to a continually updated, statewide list of registered voters should reduce the number of provisional ballots used and reduce the percentage counted since most of those who receive them will be less likely to be actually registered in the state.

- States that counted out-of-precinct ballots counted 56% of the provisional ballots cast. States that counted ballots cast only in the proper precinct counted an average of 42% of provisional ballots. [17]

---

[15] See Table 2 in Appendix 2 for information on the verification method used in each state.

[16] The Election Day Survey found that states using statewide voter registration databases reported a lower incidence of casting provisional ballots than states without voter registration databases, suggesting that better administration of voter registration rolls might be associated with fewer instances where voters would be required to cast a provisional ballot due to a problem with their voter registration.

[17] The Election Day Survey concluded that : "Jurisdictions with jurisdiction-wide provisional ballot acceptance reported higher rates of provisional ballots cast, 2.09 percent of registration or 4.67 percent of ballots cast in polling places, than those with in-precinct-only acceptance, 0.72 and 1.18 percent, respectively. Predictably, those jurisdictions with more permissive jurisdiction-wide acceptance reported higher rates of counting provisional ballots, 71.50 percent, than other jurisdictions, 52.50 percent."

  - In experienced states, the disparity was even more pronounced: 52% of provisional ballots cast were counted in states requiring in-district ballots, while 70% were counted in those allowing out-of-precinct ballots.
  - If all states had counted out-of-precinct ballots, perhaps 290,000 more provisional ballots would have been counted across the country.[18]

- States that provide a longer the time to evaluate provisional ballots counted a higher proportion of those ballots. [19]
  - Fourteen states permitted less than one week to evaluate provisional ballots, 15 states permitted between one and two weeks, and 14 states permitted greater than two weeks[20].
  - Those states that permitted less than one week counted an average of 35.4% of their ballots.
  - States that permitted between one and two weeks counted 47.1%.
  - States that permitted more than 2 weeks, counted 60.8% of the provisional ballots cast[21].
  - The effect of allowing more time for evaluation is felt most strongly in states where more than 1% of the overall turnout was of provisional ballots. In states where provisional ballots were used most heavily, those that permitted less than one week to evaluate ballots counted 58.6% while those that permitted one to two weeks counted 65.0% of ballots, and those states that permitted greater than three weeks verified the highest proportion of provisional ballots, at 73.8%.

Variation Within States

Not only was there little consistency among states in the use of provisional ballots, there was also little consistency within states. This was true in both new and old states. Of the 20 states for which we have county-level provisional ballot data, the rate of counting provisional ballots varied by as much as 90% to 100% among counties in the same state. This suggests that additional factors beyond statewide factors, such as verification requirements or the time provided for ballot evaluation, also influence the provisional voting process. Reacting to the lack of consistency within states, the Carter-Baker Commission) recommended that "states, not counties or municipalities, should establish uniform procedures for the verification and counting of provisional ballots, and that procedure should be applied uniformly throughout the state."[22]

Election Line reported that:

---

[18] This estimate is a rough approximation. States that recognize out-of-precinct ballots counted, on average, 56% of the provisional votes cast. Applying that ratio to the 1.9 million provisional ballots cast nationwide would result in 1.1 million provisional ballots that would have been counted if all states accepted out-of-precinct votes. States that did not recognize out-of-precinct ballots counted 42% of the provisional ballots cast, or about 813,000 ballots, for a difference of about 290,000 votes.

[19] See Appendix __, Relationship Between Time Allotted to Verify Provisional Ballots and the Level of Ballots that are Verified, David Andersen, The Eagleton Institute of Politics

[20] Many thanks to Ben Shepler, of the Moritz College of Law, for assembling complete data on the time requirements states permitted for the counting of provisional ballots.

[21] 43 states are included in this analysis, including Washington D.C. The 7 election-day registration states are omitted, as is Mississippi, which never provided data on provisional ballots. North Carolina is also omitted from the regressions, as it does not have a statewide policy on how it verifies provisional ballots.

[22] Recommendation 2.3.2 of the Report of the Commission on Federal Election Reform, "Building Confidence in U.S. Elections," September 2005, p.16. The report also observed that, ". . .different procedures for counting provisional ballots within and between states led to legal challenges and political protests. Had the margin of victory for the presidential contest been narrower, the lengthy dispute that followed the 2000 election could have been repeated."

- In Ohio some counties counted provisional ballots not cast in the assigned precinct even though the state's policy was to count only those ballots cast in the correct precinct.
- Some counties in Washington tracked down voters who would otherwise have had their provisional ballots rejected because they had failed to complete part of their registration form, gave them the chance to correct those omissions, and then counted the provisional ballot. This would probably not have come to light except for the sharp examination caused by the very close election for governor.

Resources available to administer provisional voting varied considerably among and within states. The result is that differences in demographics and resources result in different experiences with provisional voting. For example, the Election Day Survey found that:

- Jurisdictions with lower education and income tend to report more inactive voter registrations, lower turnout, and more provisional ballots cast.

- Jurisdictions with higher levels of income and education reported higher average numbers of poll workers per polling place or precinct and reported lower rates of staffing problems per precinct.

- Staffing problems appeared to be particularly acute for jurisdictions in the lowest income and education categories. Small, rural jurisdictions and large, urban jurisdictions tended to report higher rates of an inadequate number of poll workers within polling places or precincts.

- Predominantly non-Hispanic, Black jurisdictions reported a greater percentage of polling places or precincts with an inadequate number of poll workers. Predominantly non-Hispanic, Native American jurisdictions reported the second highest percentage of staffing problems.

The conclusions to be drawn from these findings are clear. In voting districts with lower education levels, poverty, and inadequately staffed polling places, the voting process is unlikely to function well. More people will end up casting provisional ballots. That makes the provisional voting process especially important in such districts. But if jurisdictions struggle with regular voting, how well are they likely to do with the more complicated provisional balloting process? In precincts were the voting process, in general, is managed poorly, provisional ballots cannot be expected to work much better. In these areas, the focus should be on broader measures to improve the overall functionality of struggling voting districts, although improving the management of provisional balloting may help at the margin.

Effectiveness of Provisional Voting

The certainty of our conclusions about the effectiveness of provisional voting is limited because of the complexity of the problem and a lack of important information. An ideal assessment of how well provisional ballots worked in 2004 would require knowing the decisions of local officials in 200,000 precincts on how to inform voters about provisional voting; their performance in providing a provisional ballot to those qualified to receive one, and their decisions whether to count a provisional ballot. Information needed about the eligibility or registration status of provisional voters is also not available.

We see no automatic correlation between the quality of a state's voting system and either the number of provisional ballots cast or counted. Low numbers could reflect accurate statewide voting data and good voter education. Or they could suggest that provisional ballots were not

made easily available. High numbers could be seen as signifying an effective provisional voting system or a weak registration process. But we do know that in 2004 provisional ballots allowed 1.2 million citizens to vote, citizens who would otherwise have been turned away from the polls.

Since we do not know the total number of registered voters who might have voted but could not makes a precise, quantitative estimate of the effectiveness of provisional voting impossible. The Cal Tech – MIT Voting Technology Project, however, estimated that 4 – 6 million votes were lost in the 2000 presidential election for the reasons shown in Table 1 below. The estimate is an approximation, but it may provide data good enough for a general assessment of the size of the pool of potential voters who might have been helped by the provisional ballot process.

Estimates of Votes Lost In 2000 Presidential Election

Votes Lost (Millions)	***Cause***
1.5 – 2	Faulty equipment and confusing ballots
1.5 – 3	Registration mix-ups
<1	Polling place operations
?	Absentee ballot administration

Table 1 Cal Tech – MIT Voting Technology Project Estimates
4 – 6 million votes are lost in presidential elections due to the causes shown in the table. Registration mix-ups (e.g., name not on list) and polling place operations (e.g., directed to wrong precinct) are the causes most likely to be remedied by provisional voting.

The table shows that the universe of voters who could be helped by provisional voting might be 2.5 – 3 million voters. In 2004, about 1.2 million provisional voters were counted. A rough estimate, then, of the effectiveness of provisional voting in 2004, then, might be 40% to 50% (ballots counted/votes lost)[23]. Whatever the precise figure, it seems reasonable to conclude that there is considerable room for improvement in the administration of provisional voting.

Legislative Response
Indeed, several states[24] came to the conclusion that the administration of their provisional voting procedures needed to be improved and amended their statutes after the 2004 election. State legislation adopted since the election points to particular areas of concern.

[23] Another interpretation of the data should be considered. The Census Bureau's Current Population Survey (CPS) developed the category of "registration mix-ups" to assess the states' registration systems. After each election the CPS asks people if they were registered and if they voted. The CPS gives breakdowns of reasons why people did not vote. Survey responders tend to deflect blame when answering questions about voting. In the narrow context of provisional ballots, 'registration problems' would cover only voters who went to the polls where the determination that they were not registered was wrong or they were registered, but in the wrong precinct. If they were in the wrong precinct, provisional voting can help them in only 17 states. In 2004, only 6.8% of those not voting and registered blamed registration problems, while 6.9% reported so in 2000.

[24] Twelve states made statutory or regulatory changes: Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Louisiana, Montana, New Mexico, North Carolina, Virginia and Wyoming. See Table 4 in Appendix 2.

Not enough time to examine and count the provisional ballots. Florida, Indiana, Virginia, and Washington all have clarified or extended the timeline to evaluate the ballots. But taking more time can prove a problem, particularly in presidential elections with the looming deadline to certify the vote for the Electoral College.[25]

Lack of uniform rules for counting ballots and effective training of the election officials in interpreting and applying those rules to determine the validity of ballots. Colorado, New Mexico, North Carolina, and Washington have all passed legislation focused on improving the efficacy and consistency of the voting and counting process.

Litigation

Successful legal challenges to the process highlight areas where provisional voting procedures were wanting. A flurry of litigation occurred around the country in October 2004 concerning the so-called "wrong precinct issue" – whether provisional ballots cast by voters in a precinct other than their designated one would be counted for statewide races. These lawsuits were largely unsuccessful in their stated goal: most courts, including the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit (the only federal appeals court to rule on the issue), rejected the contention that HAVA requires the counting of these wrong-precinct provisional ballots.

This litigation was significant nonetheless.

- First, the Sixth Circuit decision established the precedent that voters have the right to sue in federal court to remedy violations of HAVA.

- Second --and significantly-- the litigation clarified the right of voters to receive provisional ballots, even though the election officials were certain they would not be counted. The decision also defined an ancillary right –the right to be directed to the correct precinct. There voters could cast a regular ballot that would be counted. If they insisted on casting a provisional ballot in the wrong precinct, they would be on notice that it would be a symbolic gesture only.

- Third, these lawsuits prompted election officials to take better care in instructing precinct officials on how to notify voters about the need to go to the correct precinct in order to cast a countable ballot – although the litigation regrettably came too late to be truly effective in this regard. In many states, on Election Day 2004, the procedures in place for notifying voters about where to go were less than ideal, reflecting less-than-ideal procedures for training poll workers on this point.

There was also pre-election litigation over the question whether voters who had requested an absentee ballot were entitled to cast a provisional ballot. In both cases (one in Colorado and one, decided on Election Day, in Ohio), the federal courts ruled that HAVA requires that these voters receive a provisional ballot. Afterwards, it is for state officials under state law to

---

[25] The resources available to evaluate and count provisional ballots within a tight schedule may not be easily available. The General Accounting Office reports that Detroit, where 1,350 provisional ballots were cast and 123 counted, found the 6-day time frame for processing provisional ballots "very challenging and unrealistic. To overcome this challenge, the *entire department's employees were mobilized to process provisional ballots.*" The report also found that in Los Angeles County, "staff had to prepare duplicate ballots to remove ineligible or invalid contests when voters cast their ballots at the wrong precinct. To overcome this challenge, staffing was increased to prepare the duplicate ballots." In a close, contested election, "duplicate" ballots would doubtless receive long and careful scrutiny." See Appendix 7, GAO, "Views of Selected Local Election Officials on Managing Voter Registration and Ensuring Eligible Citizens Can Vote," September 2005. (GAO Report-05-997)

determine whether these provisional ballots will be counted, in part by determining if these provisional voters already had voted an absentee ballot (in which case one ballot should be ruled ineligible, in order to avoid double voting). These decisions confirm the basic premise that provisional ballots should be available whenever voters believe they are entitled to them, so that their preferences can be recorded, with a subsequent determination whether these preferences count as valid votes.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Because every provisional ballot counted represents a voter who, if the system had worked perfectly, should have voted by regular ballot, the advent of statewide registration databases is likely to reduce the use provisional ballots. The one area in which such databases may not make a difference is for those who voted by provisional ballot because they did not bring required identification documents to the polling place. The statewide voter registration database will facilitate verifying that ballot, but the voter will still have vote provisionally. Beyond that exception, even with statewide registries in every state, provisional voting will remain an important failsafe, and voters should have confidence that the failsafe will operate correctly.

The wide variation in the implementation of provisional voting among and particularly within states suggests that EAC can help states strengthen their processes. Research-based recommendations for best, or at least better, practices based on the experience gained in the 2004 election can be useful in states' efforts to achieve greater consistency in the administration of provisional voting.

Recommendations for Best Practices

Recent legislative activity shows that state efforts to improve the provisional voting process are underway. Those states, as well as others that have not yet begun to correct shortcomings that became apparent in 2004, can benefit from considering the best practices described here. By recommending best practices, the EAC will offer informed advice while respecting diversity among the states. One way to strengthen the recommendations and build a constituency for them would be for EAC to ask its advisory committee members to recommend as best practices procedures that have worked in their states.

Self-evaluation of Provisional Voting –4 Key Questions

The first need to achieve greater consistency within each state is to think about provisional voting systematically. As legislators, election officials, and citizens in the states prepare for the 2006 election, they should ask themselves these questions about their provisional voting systems.

1. Does the provisional voting system distribute, collect, record, and tally provisional ballots with sufficient accuracy to be seen as procedurally legitimate by both supporters and opponents of the winning candidate? Does the tally include all votes cast by properly registered voters who correctly completed the steps required?

2. Is the provisional voting system sufficiently robust to perform well under the pressure of a close election when ballot evaluation will be under scrutiny and litigation looms?

3. Do the procedural requirements of the system permit cost-efficient operation? Are the administrative demands of the system reasonably related to the staff and other resource requirements available?

4. How great is the variation in the use of provisional voting in counties or equivalent levels of voting jurisdiction within the state? Is the variation great enough to cause concern that the system may not be administered uniformly across the state?

If the answers to these questions leave room for doubt about the effectiveness of the system or some of its parts, the EAC's recommendation of best practices should provide the starting point for a state's effort to improve its provisional voting system.

Best Practices For Each Step In The Process

We examined each step of the provisional voting process to identify specific areas where the states should focus their attention to reduce the inconsistencies noted in our analysis. We offer recommendations in each area appropriate to the responsibilities that HAVA assigns the EAC for the proper functioning of the provisional voting process.

The Importance of Clarity

The EAC should emphasize above all else the importance of clarity in the rules governing every stage of provisional voting. As the Century Foundation's recent report observed, "Close elections increasingly may be settled in part by the evaluating and counting of provisional ballots. . . To avoid post election disputes over provisional ballots—disputes that will diminish public confidence in the accuracy and legitimacy of the result-- well in advance of the election, states should establish, announce, and publicize clear statewide standards for every aspect of the provisional ballot process, from who is entitled to receive a provisional ballot to which ones are counted."[26]

Litigation surrounding the 2004 election resulted in decisions that, if reflected in state statutes or regulations and disseminated in effective training for poll workers, can increase the clarity of provisional ballot procedures, increase predictability, and bolster confidence in the system. By taking the following steps, states can incorporate those court rulings into their procedures.

- Promulgate, ideally by legislation, clear standards for evaluating provisional ballots, and provide training for the officials who will apply those standards. For example, in Washington State, the court determined that an election official's failure in evaluating ballots to do a complete check against all signature records is an error serious enough to warrant recanvassing.[27] Clear direction by regulation or statute on what records to use in evaluating ballots could have saved precious time and effort and increased the reliability of the provisional voting system.

- States should provide poll workers standard information resources for the training of poll workers by local jurisdictions. Training materials might include, for example, maps or databases with instruction on how to locate polling places for potential voters who show up at the wrong place. Usable and useful information in the hands of poll workers can protect voters from being penalized by ministerial errors at the polling place.[28]

---

[26] The Century Foundation, Balancing Access and Integrity, Report of the Working Group on State Implementation of Election Reforms, July 2005.

[27] See *Washington State Republican Party v. King County Division of Records*, 103 P3d 725, 727-728 (Wash. 2004)

[28] See *Panio v. Sunderland* 824 N.E.2d 488, 490 (NY, 2005) See also Order, *Hawkins v. Blunt*, No.04-4177-CV-C-RED (W.D. Mo. October 12, 2004). While rejecting the notion that all ballots cast in the wrong precinct should be counted, the court ruled that provisional votes cast in the wrong precinct should be thrown out provided that the voter had been directed to the correct precinct. This meant that provisional votes cast in the wrong precinct (and even the

- State training materials provided to local jurisdictions should make clear that the only permissible requirement to obtain a provisional ballot is an affirmation that the voter is registered in the jurisdiction and eligible to vote in an election for federal office. [29] Recent legislation in Arizona indicates that recommendations should emphasize HAVA's requirement that persons appearing at the polling place claiming to be registered voters cannot be denied a ballot because they do not have identification with them. Poll workers may need appropriate training to understand their duty to give such voters a provisional ballot. [30]

A. Registration and Pre-Election Information for Voters

Providing crisp, clear information to voters before the election is important to the success of the provisional voting process. The better voters understand their rights and obligations, the easier the system will be to manage, and the more legitimate the appearance of the process. States can begin by assessing the utility and clarity of the information for voters on their websites and by considering what information might be added to sample ballots mailed to voters before elections. Best practices in this area would include:

1. If states require identification at the time of registration, the kind of IDs required should be stated precisely and clearly and be publicly and widely available in a form that all voters can understand. For example, "You must bring your driver's license. If you don't have a driver's license, then you must bring an ID card with your photograph on it and this ID card must be issued by a government agency. " [31]

2. The process to re-enfranchise felons should be clear and straightforward. To avoid litigation over the registration status of felons, best practice should be defined as making re-enfranchisement automatic, or no more burdensome than the process required for any new registrant.[32]

3. State or county websites for voters should offer full, clear information on boundaries of precincts, location of polling places, requirements for identification, and other necessary guidance that will facilitate registration and the casting of a regular ballot. An 800 number should also be provided. Models are available: the statewide databases in Florida and Michigan provide voters with provisional voting information, registration verification and precinct location information.

B. At the Polling Place

---

wrong polling place) would count if there were no evidence that the voter had been directed to a different polling place. The court placed a duty upon election officials to make sure the voters were in the correct locations. Note that this question would not arise in a state that counted ballots cast in the wrong polling place but within the correct county.

[29] *Sandusky County Democratic Party v. Blackwell,* 387 F.3d 565, 774 (6th Cir. 2004)

[30] *The Florida Democratic Party v. Hood,* 342 F. Supp. 2d 1073, 1075-76 (N.D. Fla. 2004). The court explained that provisional voting is designed to correct the situation that occurs when election officials do not have perfect knowledge and when they make incorrect determinations about eligibility (the "fail-safe" notion). Denying voters provisional ballots because of on-the-spot determinations directly contradicts this idea. Even before the cited decision, the Florida Secretary of State's office had determined that any voter who makes the declaration required by federal law is entitled to vote a provisional ballot, even if the voter is in the wrong precinct.

[31] Websites in 29 states describe, with varying degrees of specificity, the identification voters may need. In 18 states voters can learn something about the precinct in which they should vote. And in 6 states (California, District of Columbia, Kentucky, Michigan, North Carolina, and South Carolina) they can verify their registration on the website.

[32] The Century Foundation, op. cit.

Avoiding error at the polling place will allow more voters to cast a regular ballot and all others who request it to cast a provisional ballot.

1. The layout and staffing of the polling place, particularly the multi-precinct polling place is important. Greeters, maps, and prominently posted voter information about provisional ballots, ID requirements, and related topics can help the potential voters cast their ballot in the right place. States should require poll workers to be familiar with the options and provide the resources needed for them to achieve the knowledge needed to be helpful and effective. Colorado has clear regulations on polling place requirements, including HAVA information and voting demonstration display.[33] Many states require training of poll workers. In some states that requirement is recent: after the 2004 election, New Mexico adopted a requirement for poll workers to attend an "election school." [34] A state statutory requirement for training could facilitate uniform instruction of poll workers in those states that do not already provide it.

2. The provisional ballot should be of a design or color sufficiently different from a regular ballot to avoid confusion over counting, as occurred in Washington State. The ballot might include a tear-off leaflet with information for voters such as: "Reasons Why Your Provisional Ballot Might Not Be Counted" on one side and "What to Do if My Provisional Ballot Is Not Counted" on the other.

3. Because provisional ballots offer a fail-safe, supplies of the ballots at each polling place should be sufficient for all the potential voters likely to need them. In 2004, some polling places ran out of ballots, with unknown effects on the opportunity to vote. In Middlesex County, New Jersey, for example, on Election Day the Superior Court ordered the county clerk to assure that sufficient provisional ballots were available at several heavily used polling places, and it authorized the clerk "in the event additional provisional ballots are required . . .to photocopy official provisional ballots." [35] At least two states, Connecticut and Delaware, provide guidelines to local election officials on how to estimate the demand for provisional ballots. Connecticut sets the number at 1% of the voters in the district, Delaware at 6%.[36] States that do not offer a practical method to guide the supply of provisional ballots at polling places should consider doing so. The guideline should take into account both the number of voters in the district and the number of provisional ballots actually cast in recent elections.

4. To achieve the procedural clarity needed to forestall disputes, states should establish a clear chain of custody for the handling of provisional ballots from production through distribution, collection and, finally, evaluation. A number of states have clear procedures for at least parts of this chain of custody. All states should examine their chain-of-custody requirements for clarity. Illinois includes the potentially beneficial requirement that ballots be transported by bi-partisan teams, which offers the potential to avoid some charges of election fraud.

---

[33] 8 Colo. Code Regs. § 1505-1, Rule 7.1.
[34] 2005 N.M. Laws 270 page no. 4-5.
[35] Voting Order, November 2, 2004, Superior Court of New Jersey, Law Division, Middlesex County.
[36] Connecticut: "Equal to or not less than 1% of the number of electors who are eligible to vote in any given district, or such other number as the municipal clerk and the registrars agree is sufficient to protect voting rights. Conn. Gen. Stat. Ann. § 9-232j.Delaware: Each County Department of Elections Office is required to provide to each election district a number of provisional ballots equal to 6% of registered voters in that district, with a minimum allocation of 15 ballots. Additional supplies to be delivered when the supply becomes "very low." Del.Code Ann. Tit 15 § 4948(e).

C. Evaluating Voter Eligibility and Counting Provisional Ballots

The clarity of criteria for evaluating voter eligibility is critical to a sound process for deciding which of the cast provisional ballots should be counted. Public recognition of the validity of those criteria is important to establishing the legitimacy of the system as a whole. The experience in 2004 in North Carolina, Washington, and Ohio underlines the importance of clear criteria. As the Century Foundation report put it, "Whatever procedures the states choose [to determine if a provisional ballot should be counted], the paramount consideration—as with all others concerning provisional voting—is that they be clear and thus not susceptible to post-election manipulation and litigation."[37] Nonetheless, the *Panio v. Sutherland*[38] decision in New York shows the difficulty of defining the range of administrative errors from which the provisional voters should be held harmless. Even when the standard is "clerical error" judges can differ over what that means exactly. Possibly a state law might be able to clarify a definition by giving examples of clerical errors, but even then the definition is unlikely to be perfect.

1. State statutes or regulations should define a reasonable period for voters who lack the HAVA-specified ID or other information bearing on their eligibility to provide it in order to facilitate the state's ability to verify that the person casting the provisional ballot is the same one who registered. While there may be a concern to ensure that the individual who returns with the ID may not be the same individual who cast the provisional ballot, the spirit of HAVA demands that the opportunity to prove identity be provided after Election Day. A signature match can go far in establishing that the individual who voted and the individual returning later with identification is, in fact, the same person. Encouraging a voter who lacks ID on Election Day to return later to help the verification process by providing proper identification will strengthen the system and increase public confidence in the electoral process. Our data indicate that some voters would prefer to return with ID rather than to sign an affidavit, perhaps because of uncertainty about the legal process involved in the affidavit. At least 11 states allow voters to provide ID or other information one to 13 days after voting. Of particular interest is Kansas, which allows voters to proffer their ID by electronic means or by mail, as well as in person.[39]

2. More provisional ballots are counted in those states that verify ballots cast outside the correct precinct. [40] While HAVA arguably leaves this decision up to the states, pointing out the effect of the narrower definition on the portion of ballots counted could be useful to the states in deciding this question. States should be aware, however, of the

---

[37] The Century Foundation, op. cit.

[38] 4 N.Y.3d 123, 824 N.E.2d 488 (N.Y. 2005) and Memorandum (LaPlante—Foley) Provisional Ballot Cases by State, July 19, 2005.

[39] In Kansas, the voter can provide ID to a County Election Officer any time before the County Board of Canvassers meets to count provisional ballots. KS. ST. 25-1122(d). ID can be presented in person, OR via mail or electronic means. *Id.* The Board must meet either on the Friday or Monday following a Tuesday election. *Id.* at 25-3104. Deadlines in other states are: Alabama -- 5:00 P.M. on the Monday following the election AL ST § 17-10A-2(c)_(1) Florida: until 5:00 P.M. on the third day following the election . Fla. Stat. Ann. § 101.048 (adopted after the 2004 election);Georgia—no later than 2 days after the election. GA ST § 21-2-417; 419. Illinois- 2 days to submit additional information 10 Ill. Comp. Stat. Ann. 5/18A-15(d); Indiana— in 2004 the deadline was the close of the polls IN. ST. §. 3-11.7-5-2(a). The time period was extended to 13 days by the adoption of Indiana Code 3-11-8, Section 25, Subsection (l); Maryland—until the meeting of the Election Board; MD ELEC LAW § 11-303. New Jersey— until the close of business on the second day after the election 19:53C-3(i). Nevada— until 5:00 P.M. on the Friday following the election NV ST 293.3085; New Mexico—until 7:00 P.M. on Election Day NM ADC 1.10.22 (8) (H).

[40] See Andersen, op. cit, pgs. 23 – 24 for an analysis of the significant effect of counting out-of-precinct ballots. The Election Day Survey found that, "Most notably, jurisdictions that permitted jurisdiction-wide acceptance of provisional ballots reported higher rates of provisional ballots being cast, but also reported a much higher incidence of provisional ballots being counted, than other jurisdictions."

additional burden placed on the ballot-evaluation process when out-of-precinct ballots are considered. And tradeoffs are involved if out-of-precinct voters are unable to vote for the local offices that might appear on the ballot in their district of residence. One option for states is to involve the voters in the decision by pointing out that voters who cast their provisional ballots in the wrong precinct may not be able to participate in the local election. The voter could then decide to go to the correct precinct or vote provisionally for the higher offices at the top of the ticket only.

3. Alternatively, if a state chooses to require voters to appear at their assigned precinct, where the same polling site serves more than one precinct, a voter's provisional ballot should count so long as the voter cast that ballot at the correct polling site even if at the wrong precinct within that location. [41] Ideally the voter could be directed to the correct machine, but poll worker advice will not always be correct. One way to assess the balance of issues here is to consider that, If a voter in a multi-precinct polling place is sent to the wrong machine, the error is probably the poll worker's, and the voter should not be penalized.

4. Officials should follow a written procedure, and perhaps a checklist, to identify the reason why a provisional ballot is rejected (e.g., check the applicable box "unregistered voter"; "lack of signature match" "wrong precinct," etc.) Those forms should be disclosed publicly when completed. Colorado's election rules offer particularly clear guidance to the official evaluating a provisional ballot.[42]

Colorado Rejection Codes (Any ballot given a rejection code shall not be counted):

- RFS (Rejection federal or state) No federal or state candidates or issues to duplicate.
- RNS (Rejection not signed) Provisional Ballot Affidavit not signed.
- RIN (Rejection incomplete information provided) Required information is incomplete and the designated election official is unable to confirm voter's eligibility.
- RNR (Rejection not registered) Voter did not register by the voter registration deadline or by emergency registration, Colorado voter registration record was not found, or voter was previously cancelled and has not been reinstated pursuant to 1-2-605(10). C.R.S.
- REE (Rejection envelope empty) Provisional ballot envelope is empty.
- RAB (Rejection voter voted absentee) Designated election official has confirmed that voter voted an absentee ballot.
- REV (Rejection based on ballot cast in early voting) Voter voted early.
- RIP (Rejection based on incorrect party) Incorrect Party in Primary Election.
- RFE (Rejection felon not eligible to vote) Individual was convicted of a felony and is either serving a sentence of confinement or detention or is on parole.
- RWC (Rejection elector not registered in county or State of Colorado) Non-county or non-state resident; therefore voter not eligible to vote in the county where the provisional ballot was voted.
- RID (Rejection first time voter has not supplied identification upon registration or thereafter prior to and during time voter voted) First Time Voter who

[41] Chances are administrative error accounts for the voter being directed to the wrong precinct under these circumstances.
[42] 8 CCR 1505-1, at 26.5.4, adopted august 4, 2005. See also 1-2-509(3) C.R.S.

registered by mail or through a voter registration drive, is tagged as id deficient, and did not provide id at the time of voting.

RRD (Rejection registration deficient) Voter had deficient or incomplete registration and required information was not provided prior to or at the time of filling in the provisional ballot envelope. Voter's eligibility cannot be established.

D. Verification of Provisional Ballots

1. States that use the information on the provisional ballot to permit voters who have changed their addresses to update their registrations should adopt clear procedures on that process and specify how the new information will be communicated between different Boards of Elections

2. In verifying provisional ballots, the time by which election officials must make their eligibility determinations is particularly important in presidential elections because of the need to certify electors to the Electoral College. States should consider in particular how to divide the time allowed them by the safe-harbor provisions that apply in presidential elections to the certification to the Electoral College. Some part of this five-week period will be consumed by the eligibility evaluation, but states should take care to provide a sufficient period of time as well for challenges. If a state consumes 21 days following the election in the eligibility evaluations, only two weeks will remain for legal challenges to be concluded. Is that sufficient? Or should the state provide the resources needed to complete the eligibility determinations in 10 days or two weeks, leaving three weeks or more for legal challenges in a close election? Our research did not identify an optimum division of the five weeks available. The prudent course here would be to encourage states to consider the issue and then make a careful decision about how to complete all steps in the evaluation of ballots and challenges to those determinations within the five weeks available.

E. Post-election Information for Voters

Timely information to voters about the disposition of their provisional ballot will provide helpful feedback and more important enable voters to determine if they are registered for future elections and, if not, what they need to do to become registered.

1. Establish mechanisms to ensure that voters casting provisional ballots are informed whether they are now registered for future elections and, if not, what they need to do to become registered.

F. State Laws Governing Litigation over Provisional Voting

1. Establish special, streamlined litigation procedures for Election Day complaints that individuals are being denied the right to cast a provisional ballot

<u>Broader Considerations</u>

G. Integrity and the Appearance of Integrity

1. State laws or regulations providing for non-partisan or bi-partisan bodies to make a public determination of the validity of provisional ballots would increase confidence in the system.

2. To improve transparency, state laws or regulations should require the purging process for registration to be public and with an opportunity for voters to correct an erroneous determination that they should be purged.

3. State laws or regulation should require the evaluation process for provisional ballots to be public, while protecting the names of those who voted provisionally.

H. Continuous Assessment of the Provisional Ballot -- Process and Performance

Defining what makes for a successful provisional voting system is difficult. The most successful system is probably not the one with the most provisional votes cast (that could indicate problems with the registration system). Nor is the system with the greatest number counted or with the fewest counted necessarily superior because the evaluation process could be flawed.

Defining quality requires a broad perspective about how well the system works, how open it is to error recognition and correction, and how well provisional voting processes are connected to the registration and voter identification regimes. The EAC should consider engaging one of the national quality organizations or processes, such as Six Sigma[43] or the Baldridge Quality process [44] to evaluate the provisional ballot process. Pending such a review, the EAC can recommend that states take the following actions.

1. Recognize that the first step to improving quality is to see the provisional voting process as a system and take a systems approach to regular evaluation through standardized metrics with explicit goals for performance.
2. States should begin by collecting data systematically on the provisional voting process so that they can evaluate their voting system and assess changes from one election to the next. The effort should start in the 2006 election, and the data collected should include:
    - -- Provisional votes cast and counted by jurisdiction, say counties, with details on why the voter had to vote provisionally (lack of ID, not on list, challenged at polling place, issued absentee ballot, etc) and number of ballots actually counted in each category.
    - -- Reasons why provisional ballots were not counted, using categories such as those that have been adopted by Colorado, described earlier in this report.
    - -- Measures of variance among jurisdictions.
    - -- Number of poll workers trained in administration of provisional voting by polling place
    - -- Number of jurisdictions posting information on provisional voting in the polling place
    - -- Time required to evaluate ballots by jurisdiction

---

[43] Six Sigma is a measure of quality that strives for near perfection. Six Sigma is a disciplined, data-driven approach and methodology for eliminating defects (driving towards six standard deviations between the mean and the nearest specification limit) in any process -- from manufacturing to transactional and from product to service.

[44] The Baldrige Criteria for Performance Excellence provide a systems perspective for understanding performance management. They reflect validated, leading-edge management practices against which an organization can measure itself. With their acceptance nationally and internationally as the model for performance excellence, the Criteria represent a common language for communication among organizations for sharing best practices. The Criteria are also the basis for the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award process.

Improving understanding of the provisional voting process through analysis of detailed information will enable state and local election officials to strengthen their systems. By collecting and analyzing this data states can identify which aspects of the registration and electoral system are most important in shunting voters into the provisional ballot process. Responsible officials can then look to their registration system, identification requirements or poll worker training as a way to reduce the need for voters to cast their ballots provisionally.

ATTACHMENT 1 – Data Sources for Classification of the States

Our research on provisional voting divided the various states into several categories to allow an assessment of how different factors may have influenced the process of casting and counting provisional ballots. This analysis was conducted before the release of the Election Day Study, and the categories we used may differ in some respects from its work. The variables used to analyze a state's use of provisional ballots:

1. New vs. Old (states that used a provisional ballot before the 2004 election)
2. Use of a statewide database of registered voters vs. no use of a statewide database
3. Counting out-of-precinct ballots vs. not counting out-of-precinct ballots
4. Voter identification requirements
5. Method used to verify provisional ballots
6. Levels of provisional ballots cast and counted

We first assigned states within these categories based on classifications done by Electionline.org in its studies. The Electionline data was the only published information available at the time of our research. We reviewed the Electionline data carefully, and, in select cases, updated it with new, detailed information that had become available after its publication. The changes we made are explained below.

--Idaho, Maine, Minnesota, New Hampshire, Wisconsin and Wyoming were excluded from our analysis. They have election-day registration systems, and did not need to use HAVA-compliant provisional ballots.

--North Dakota does not register voters, so it also was excluded from HAVA requirements and did not use provisional voting.

--Mississippi has not reported its provisional voting results and could not be included in our analysis, though it was compliant in 2004.

--Pennsylvania did not report its totals for the Election Day Study, but we obtained information on Pennsylvania and included it in our analysis.

New vs. Old States

We classified states as "new" or "old" based on the 2001 Electionline study of provisional voting,[45] but condensed its classifications into a single dichotomous variable, new/old with all other cases excluded. The Electionline study divided states into five categories of their use of provisional ballots in the 2000 election:

1. Use of provisional ballots (P)
2. Limited use of provisional ballots (LP)
3. Affidavit ballots (A)
4. No system in place (N)
5. Unnecessary/Not Applicable (U/NA)

We included in the list of "Old States" all states listed as using provisional ballots, limited use of provisional ballots or affidavit ballots. States in all three categories would have been familiar with key aspects of provisional voting.. States that had no provisional voting system in place for the 2002 election, and were HAVA compliant in 2004, were listed as "new" states, as 2004 would have been the first year in which they would be offering the option of provisional voting. States that were listed as unnecessary or not applicable were excluded from this study, as they

[45] This study can be found at: http://electionline.org/Portals/1/Publications/Provisional%20Voting.pdf.

were exempt from the HAVA regulations in 2004 because they either allowed same-day registration or did not register voters.

Rhode Island is the only state categorized as an old state by Electionline that we moved into the list of new states. Electionline's map shows Rhode Island as a state that used provisional voting in 2000, but in the state description, it is listed as having no system in place. We learned from the Rhode Island Board of Elections that the state had previously permitted potential voters to sign an affidavit if they did not appear on a precinct's list of registered voters, but felt they were registered to vote. Based on the signed affidavit, the election official would then contact a county official to see if the voter was on a more complete registration list. If the voter's name was on the complete list, that voter was permitted to cast a regular ballot. As this process did not grant the voter a provisional ballot, but served as a different type of administrative failsafe, we concluded that Rhode Island's first use of provisional voting was in 2004 and, therefore, classified the state as "new" to the system of provisional balloting.

Table 1
CATEGORIZATION OF STATES -- Old and New

Old States	New States	HAVA Exempt or NA
Alaska	Connecticut	Idaho
Alabama	Delaware	Maine
Arkansas	Georgia	Minnesota
California	Hawaii	New Hampshire
Colorado	Illinois	North Dakota
DC	Indiana	Wisconsin
Florida	Louisiana	Wyoming
Iowa	Massachusetts	
Kansas	Missouri	
Kentucky	Montana	
Maryland	Nevada	
Michigan	Oklahoma	
Mississippi	Pennsylvania	
Nebraska	Rhode Island	
New Jersey	South Dakota	
New Mexico	Tennessee	
New York	Utah	
North Carolina	Vermont	
Ohio		
Oregon		
South Carolina		
Texas		
Virginia		
Washington		
West Virginia		
26	**18**	**7**

Statewide List of Registered Voters

The Electionline preview of the 2004 Election[46] was the starting point for compiling a list of states that had a statewide database of registered voters. That study listed 34 States that did not have their statewide database systems complete, and 16 that did, including the District of Columbia. North Dakota does not register voters, so does not need to compile such a database. Electionline's criterion for concluding that a state had a statewide list was that the state have participation from all jurisdictions in a statewide system. We added Oklahoma to the list of states with statewide databases because we found it had met the Electionline criteria by the 2004 election, albeit too late for inclusion in the Electionline survey.

Out-of-Precinct Ballots

We based our classification of states that allow the counting of ballots cast outside the correct precinct on the data in the 2004 Electionline preview of the 2004 election[2]. States that evaluated ballots cast in a precinct where the voter was not registered were categorized as "out-of-precinct." States that invalidated such ballots were categorized as "In-precinct only."

Table 2
CATEGORIZATION OF STATES -- Counting Out-Of-Precinct Ballots

Out-of-Precinct	In-Precinct Only	HAVA EXEMPT OR NA
Alaska	Alabama	Idaho
Arkansas	Arizona	Maine
California	Colorado	Mississippi
Delaware	Connecticut	New Hampshire
Georgia	District of Columbia	North Dakota
Illinois[47]	Florida	Wisconsin
Kansas	Hawaii	Wyoming
Louisiana	Indiana	
Maryland	Iowa	
New Mexico	Kentucky	
North Carolina	Massachusetts	
Oregon	Michigan	
Pennsylvania	Missouri	
Rhode Island	Montana	
Utah	Nebraska	
Vermont	Nevada	
Washington	New Jersey	
	New York	
	Ohio	
	Oklahoma	
	South Carolina	
	South Dakota	
	Tennessee	
	Texas	
	Virginia	
	West Virginia	
17	26	7

[46] "Election Preview 2004: What's changed, What Hasn't and Why". This study can be found at: http://electionline.org/Portals/1/Publications/Election.preview.2004.report.final.update.pdf

[47] In Illinois, it is not clear that all counties followed this procedure. Some counties may not have counted out-of-precinct ballots.

02311

Verification Method

We identified four different ways states assessed provisional ballots to determine if they should be counted: signature match, match voter data, signed affidavits, and bringing back identification later. We gathered information about these verification techniques by checking state websites and consulting journalistic accounts. We consulted state legislation to provide further information where needed.

Table 3
CATEGORIZATION OF STATES -- Ballot Evaluation Methods

Signature Match	Data Match	Affidavit	Return with ID	NA
Alaska	Alabama	Connecticut	Indiana	Idaho
California	Arizona	Delaware	Iowa	Maine
Florida	Arkansas	Georgia	Kansas	Mississippi
Oregon	Colorado	Hawaii	Maryland	Minnesota
	DC	Illinois	Michigan	New Hampshire
	Louisiana	Kentucky	Montana	N. Carolina*
	Missouri	Massachusetts	New Jersey	N. Dakota
	Ohio	Nebraska	New Mexico	Wisconsin
	Oklahoma	Nevada	Texas	Wyoming
	Pennsylvania	New York	Utah	
	Rhode Island	South Dakota		
	S. Carolina	Tennessee		
	Washington	Vermont		
	West Virginia	Virginia		
4	14	14	10	9

* North Carolina lacked clear standards to evaluate provisional ballots and is excluded from this analysis.

Data Collection

To assemble our data for analysis, we began by using the data on provisional votes cast and counted reported by Electionline. To increase the accuracy of this data, we surveyed each state's election websites for updated data, and for reported numbers on the county level. We then sent emails to 49 (we excluded Alaska, see below) states and the District of Columbia, requesting updated data on the number of provisional votes cast and counted by county. We received information from 25 states by our cut-off date of August 25, 2005.

Table 4
Updated information by State

Received Updated Data	Did Not Receive Updated Data
California	Alabama
District of Columbia	Alaska[48]
Florida	Arizona
Hawaii	Arkansas
Indiana	Colorado
Iowa	Connecticut
Kansas	Delaware
Louisiana	Georgia
Maryland[49]	Idaho
Missouri	Illinois
Montana	Kentucky
Nebraska[50]	Maine
Nevada	Massachusetts
New Jersey	Michigan
New Mexico	Minnesota
Ohio	Mississippi
Oklahoma	New Hampshire
Oregon	New York
Pennsylvania	North Carolina
Rhode Island	North Dakota
South Dakota	South Carolina
Tennessee	Utah
Texas	Vermont
Virginia	Wisconsin
Washington	Wyoming
West Virginia	
26 States	**25 States**

[48] Alaska was not contacted via email, as the state does not have voting districts comparable to counties in other states and could not be matched with comparable census data.
[49] Maryland reported provisional ballots that were counted per county, but not number cast.
[50] Nebraska reported an incomplete list of provisional ballots cast and counted by county, but designated counties by number, rather than by name.

Data Differences

The data used in this study differ from the data reported in the Election Day Study for 19 states. The Election Day Study was not completed until well after our statistical analysis of provisional voting was finished. Where there are differences, they are typically very small, usually fewer than 100 votes either cast or counted. Of the 9 states that have differences of more than 100 votes cast or counted, 7 have reported their numbers directly to us and can be considered updated data that EDS had not obtained. For one of those states, New Mexico, EDS had incomplete data, and for another, Pennsylvania, EDS had no data at all. The data that we have collected reflects updated numbers from the states that have changed following recounts and litigation that altered how ballots were evaluated.

Table 5
Data Differences with the Election Day Study

State	EDS Numbers Cast/Counted	Our Numbers Cast/Counted	Differences	Updated Info from State?[51]
Alabama	6,478/1,865	6560/1836	82/29	No
Alaska	23,285/22,498	23,275/22,498	10/0	No
Colorado	51,529/39,086	51,477/39,163	52/77	No
Georgia	12,893/4,489	12,893/3,839	0/650	No
Hawaii	346/25	348/25	2/0	Yes
Iowa	15,406/8,038	15,454/8,048	48/10	Yes
Kansas	45,535/32,079	45,563/31,805	28/274	Yes
Montana	688/378	653/357	35/21	Yes
Nebraska	17,421/13,788	17,003/13,298	418/490	Yes
Nevada	6,153/2,446	6,154/2,447	1/1	Yes
New Mexico	6,410/2,914	15,360/8,767	8,950/5,853	Yes
N. Carolina	77,469/50,370	77,469/42,348	0/8,022	No
Ohio	157,714/123,902	158,642/123,548	928/354	Yes
Pennsylvania	No data	53,698/26,092	53,698/26,092	Yes
Texas	35,282/7,156	36,193/7,770	911/614	Yes
Vermont	121/30	101/37	20/7	No
Virginia	4,608/728	4,609/728	1/0	Yes
Washington	92,402/73,806	86,239/69,273	6,163/4,533	Yes
Wisconsin	374/119	373/120	1/1	No

[51] Data not provided by the state itself is taken from Electionline figures.

Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV
06/28/2006 11:56 AM

To Darrell D. Lee/CONTRACTOR/EAC/GOV
cc
bcc
Subject Fw: Voter ID Report and Appendices

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Research Manager
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1225 New York Avenue , NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
tel:202-566-3123

---- Forwarded by Karen Lynn-Dyson/EAC/GOV on 06/28/2006 11:54 AM ----

"Tom O'neill" [redacted]
05/08/2006 07:15 PM

To [redacted]
cc [redacted]
Subject Voter ID Report and Appendices

Karen,

Attached is the final draft report on our Voter ID analysis, revised to incorporate the comments made by the EAC at and after our meeting in Washington and the new statistical analysis performed by Tim Vercellotti, which I sent you last Friday. Included in the attached file are about 60 pages of appendices. You may or may not want to distribute all the appendices to the reviewers who will take part in Thursday's conference call. They might find Appendix A useful; it provides a detailed summary of the actual statutory language on Voter ID in each of the states. The other appendices, which are called for as deliverables in the contract, provide worthwhile information for the record, but are not likely to offer material for the reviewers to focus on.

When it comes time to distribute this material to the advisory boards before our meeting with them in May, once again you may want to exercise judgment about how much of it is likely to prove of interest to them.

We look forward to Thursday's teleconference.

Tom O'Neill

VoterIDReport0508.doc

REVISED FINAL DRAFT
05/08/06

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE EAC VOTER IDENTIFICATION ISSUES

Report Background

This report to the United States Election Assistance Commission (EAC) analyzes the effects of voter identification requirements on turnout in the 2004 election and makes recommendations for best practices to evaluate proposals for voter ID requirements. It is based on research conducted by the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, and the Moritz College of Law at Ohio State University under a contract to the EAC, dated May 24, 2005. The research included a review and legal analysis of state statutes, regulations and litigation concerning voter identification and provisional voting, and a statistical analysis of the effects of various requirements for voter identification on turnout in the 2004 election. This report is a companion to a draft report on Provisional Voting submitted to the EAC on November 28, 2005 under the same contract.

The Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) (Public Law 107-252) authorizes the EAC (Sec. 241, 42 USC 15381) to conduct periodic studies of election administration issues. The purpose of these studies is to promote methods for voting and administering elections, including provisional voting, that are convenient, accessible and easy to use; that yield accurate, secure and expeditious voting systems; that afford each registered and eligible voter an equal opportunity to vote and to have that vote counted; and that are efficient.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Methods

To explore the effects of voter ID requirements on electoral participation in 2004, as measured by turnout, we gathered information on the requirements in effect in the 50 states and the District of Columbia in that year. We assigned each state to one of five categories based on its ID requirements. They are progressively more rigorous based on the demands they make on voters.[1] The categories range from "Stating Name" which we judge to be somewhat less demanding than "Signing Name." "Signature Match" requires poll workers to examine the signature and compare it to a sample, which is slightly more demanding that the voter simply signing. "Present ID" requires voters to offer some documentary evidence of their identity,

[1] Even the most relaxed provisions for identification at the polls –anything stricter than the honor system used in North Dakota—will impose some burden on particular voters. Harvard Law Review 119:1146